

# Contemporary Review

incorporating THE FORTNIGHTLY

DECEMBER 1961

THE WORLD'S CHURCHES AT NEW DELHI . . . . . CECIL NORTHCOTT

## FORUM FEATURE

Lords Reform . . . . . DERYCK ABEL

## REPORT ON FRANCE

Gaullist Prospects . . . . . W. L. MIDDLETON

## AMERICAN VISTAS

I Anti-Americanism in Britain. . . . . PROF. H. C. ALLEN

II Propaganda and Ideological Conflicts, 1917-1945:  
Need for Psychological Peacefare—I . . . . . PROF. BERNARD RUBIN

III Juvenile Delinquency in the U.S.A. . . . . PROF. JOSEPH ROUCEK

POST-WAR BUILDING IN CAMBRIDGE . . . . . VIVIAN I. GASTER

## FRENCH PROFILE

Mme du Châtelet and her Lovers—I  
Maupertuis . . . . . G. P. GOOCH

## THEATRE

A Little Madness in the "Method" . . . . . REID DOUGLAS

## SPECIAL REPORT

Greece After the Polls. . . . . THOMAS ANTHEM

## LITERARY SUPPLEMENT

David Thomson	Deryck Abel	Prof. George Catlin
Michael Stevenson	Beryl Gaster	William Kean Seymour
Désirée Hirst	Michael Compton	

Price 4/- (Postage 5d. per copy)

53/- per annum

U.S.A. and Canada \$10.00

*The new venue for Collectors and Dealers*

## Westminster Antique Galleries

Open Daily, Monday—Friday, 10-30 a.m. - 6 p.m.

Over 40 displays of  
every description

Opposite St. James' Park  
Underground

42, Broadway,  
Westminster, S.W.1.

# THE WORLD TODAY

*Issued by the  
Royal Institute  
of International  
Affairs*

To be well informed, you need the facts. In The WORLD TODAY experts bring to the general reader up-to-date and reliable information on current world problems. Factual and objective, The WORLD TODAY also focuses on internal political and economic conditions in individual countries, in order to provide a background to events of international significance.

Current issue includes articles on **Germany after the Election**, **South Africa Today**, **The Twenty-second Congress of the C.P.S.U.**, and **The Commonwealth Problem in the Common Market**.

*Monthly 2s. 6d. per copy. 30s. a year  
(In U.S. and Canada \$4.80)*

*Orders may be sent to booksellers and newsagents or to  
Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C.4*

## The Liberal News Speaks out for Liberalism

There is nowhere else you can be sure of finding week by week a comprehensive record of the activity of the reviving Liberal Party and a broad platform for all that is most significant in developing Liberal opinion.

**Topical**

**Vigorous**

**Informative**

THE ONLY ORGAN IN THE PRESS  
CONTROLLED BY THE PARTY

*Every Thursday Sixpence*

Editor: Deryck Abel  
Consulting Editor: G. P. Gooch, CH, FBA, D Litt.

# Contemporary Review

December 1961

Founded 1866

incorporating The Fortnightly

## THE WORLD'S CHURCHES AT NEW DELHI

CECIL NORTHCOTT

**T**O STAGE a major Christian assembly in a land which is avowedly non-Christian, such as India, calls for shrewd insight as well as courage. The World Council of Churches had long planned its third assembly "somewhere in Asia" and had chosen Ceylon, but turned away from it as its political barometer swayed and swivelled. India's hospitality was assured and the Assembly will occupy the Vigyan Bhavan at New Delhi (built specially for international gatherings) from November 18 to December 6, 1961.

The two previous assemblies of the Council, which now has 178 member churches representing more than 300 million Christians, were held in Amsterdam and Evanston, USA, where they had the advantage of a matured Christian background in settings which were familiar to the assembled delegates. The New Delhi meeting will meet in a certain isolation in a city which has only a meagre Christian community to give it a welcome. But the fact of its presence in New Delhi and in India is an important one if the claim of Christianity to belong to the East as well as to the West is to be demonstrated both in numbers and prestige.

Something of this was in the minds of its planners. Genuine propaganda can never be far from Christian planning, and the New Delhi meeting will be a kind of prominent placard displayed in India for 17 days, and the hope is that, by press and radio, India may be aware of organized Christianity in a manner to which it is unaccustomed.

But an assembly such as this which transports 600 official leaders of the

### FORTHCOMING CONTRIBUTORS INCLUDE

- THE RIGHT HON LORD BEVERIDGE, KCB
- THE RIGHT HON LORD BIRKETT
- THE RIGHT HON JO GRIMOND, MP
- NEVILLE CARDUS on DELIUS
- DR G. P. GOOCH, CH, FBA, D Litt  
ON MME DU CHÂTELET AND HER LOVERS—II
- PROFESSOR JOSEPH ROUCEK  
ON ALBANIA IN GEOPOLITICS
- AXEL HEYST  
—REPORT ON SPAIN

world's churches to India for 17 days, and adds to their train a tribe of 400 consultants, advisers, experts, and the like, to say nothing of attendant press and radio reporters, must have more than a propaganda intent. The World Council makes it very clear that this Assembly is its Assembly. It has not had a chance of meeting since 1954, seven long years of trouble and trial for the Christian faith which nowadays must think and act in world-terms even though the hope of a united World Church lies far beyond any known horizon. So there is a domestic air about New Delhi as this young, adolescent Council looks at its life and struggles to find its direction for the next seven years.

There will be some significant accessions to its membership, and some withdrawals. The most significant accession will be that of the Russian Orthodox Church which ever since 1948 has been toying with the idea of becoming a member. A two-thirds vote has to be secured to admit the Russians, but all the signs are that this will be forthcoming. "Nothing has occurred in the Russian Church to make it less acceptable as a member in 1961 than it was in 1948," says Dr. Visser 't Hooft, the Council's general secretary, "a reversal in the World Council's position would have to come from an alteration in our outlook on ecumenicity. Receiving the Russians would involve fewer open questions and hazards in 1961 than would gladly have been accepted in 1948. The World Council is an entity with already established characteristics and methods of procedure. There are abundant precedents out of the formative years; we are now sure that every study and activity will be based on biblical theology, not political casuistry."

The Russians come in, but the Reformed Churches in South Africa, with the exception of the Cape Church,\* go out on racial grounds. The World Council has tried with immense patience to retain the Reformed Churches within its fellowship but the *apartheid* bug has bitten too deeply into church as well as state in South Africa for that miracle to happen. Two all-African churches are to be admitted—the Moravian Church of the West Cape Province and the Church of Central Africa (Rhodesia), as well as the Union of Baptist Churches of Cameroun, the Presbyterian Church in Trinidad and the Evangelical Church of New Caledonia.

What holds this diverse group of churches together, and, on the whole, during the last 13 years, has increased their sense of interdependence? However many symbols and phrases may be invented to describe this movement of the world's churches towards rather than away from one another there is always the indefinable to be reckoned with. A Christian compulsion is the underlying motive force, a sense that this is the divine will for the churches whatever their confessional and national allegiances may be. It is nothing short of the miraculous that brings an Orthodox priest into the same discussion group as a Protestant pastor from one of the conservative churches of the mid-west in the United States, and puts an Anglican Archbishop alongside a Baptist layman. Outwardly the unity of the Council is created by a loyalty to the basis of membership which will be amended at New Delhi to read:

The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of churches which confess

\* The Cape Synod has since voted itself out of the World Council.—EDITOR.

But  
dema  
have  
has l  
have  
in th  
action  
and c  
alread  
on wh  
down  
gregat  
mid-tv  
comm  
A st  
even r  
formal  
Mission  
non-R



When ordering books, whether from Booksellers or Librarians, it is a great help both to them and to us, as well as to Authors and Publishers, if you inform them of the month in which the Review or the Advertisement appeared in the

**CONTEMPORARY  
REVIEW**



## **WILL YOU GET A PENSION?**

People not in pensionable employment are now able to provide themselves with a pension on very favourable terms.

In view of the widely differing circumstances of the individuals concerned, we have designed two separate forms of contract, of which one or the other can be adapted to suit most requirements.

Write for our booklet "Your Pension — Which Way?" for full details of these two plans.

**UNITED KINGDOM  
PROVIDENT INSTITUTION**



*for Mutual Life Assurance*  
33-36 Gracechurch Street, London, E.C.3.  
*Tel: Mansion House 6543*

the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour according to the Scriptures and therefore seek to fulfil together their common calling to the glory of one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

But the years of association have already done something more than demand a subscription to a basis however acceptable it may be. They have seen the growth of an understanding fellowship which for centuries has been absent from the separated traditions of the church. Not only have "speaking terms" been established, but a kind of active partnership in theological debate, in ecumenical good-works, and in a philosophy of action towards the world's social order has evolved. It is all un-formulated, and equally non-authoritative for the Council's individual members, but already a corpus of guidance has been built up on most of the great issues on which the church is expected to speak today. That wisdom percolates down through the national assemblies of the churches to the local congregations of the churches, and so to individual believers who can in this mid-twentieth century feel that they are truly part of a world Christian community.

A step will be taken at New Delhi to make this world community sense even more realistic. One of the first acts of the Assembly will be the formal merger of the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council, the senior of the two world organizations of the non-Roman Catholic Churches. For the last seven years this merger has

been under consideration while the intensive debate on the place of independent missionary boards and societies has proceeded. Missions, as such, have taken some heavy battering in recent years, and, like colonialism, have appeared to be in decline as the white man's supremacy has faded from Asia and Africa. But the sense of "mission" in the life of the Christian Church as a whole has increased, and from being the dedicated concern of a few enthusiasts the missionary task of the church has been lifted on to a new plane of concern for the total church. To symbolise this marriage of "mission" and "church" the International Missionary Council becomes the Commission of World Mission and Evangelism of the World Council.

But apart from these "domestic" concerns the churches at New Delhi will seek to gain some new light on their life, and on the meaning of the Christian faith itself. And the choice of the Assembly theme, "Jesus Christ, the Light of the World", is an expressive sign of the awareness of the churches that together they must seek light. In India and Asia generally the phrase will be understood in its application to religion which is regarded as light on the human pathway. But Christianity, the faith of a human Incarnation, brings vague teachings about light down to a very earthy earth. That is why the Assembly at New Delhi will divide itself into three sections of some 200 people each and will consider the Assembly theme under the headings of Witness, Service and Unity.

New Delhi faces a very tough non-Christian world which fastens a wary and critical eye on any organization with a western history or western taint, and however much it claims universality, Christianity still looks western in the east. What sort of programme of propagation is Christianity to foster in Asia during the next decade? Is it strong enough to face the resurgence of the eastern religions? Is it winning a new generation of Christians amongst the college and high school pupils of India and other Asian countries? Can it go on making such stupendous claims for itself as the unique revelation of God, and yet put up such a poor show in numbers and achievement?

Questions of this kind have, of course, faced the Christian in Asia ever since he penetrated the East. But they are being asked today with a sharper accent, and a more penetrating perception than at any time in history, and the New Delhi Assembly itself in seeking light on them will perform a duty not only to itself but to the whole Christian Church.

The second section, that faces the task of seeking new light on what Christian Service really means in the modern world, meets two issues head on from the start. Is Christianity merely a remedial religion, giving first-aid and copious advice to the world, or is it—in itself—a revolutionary, transforming movement? This issue is raised acutely in the new countries of Africa and Asia, where in one vast leap new nations are achieving power and freedom often without mature guidance. Is the church being a tutor and mediator for the new nations as it was in the early days of developing Europe and North America? Few would claim that it has this authority in Asia and Africa, but the New Delhi meeting asserts the place of the Christian faith within the social order where the rôle

of the Christian congregation could be a genuinely formative one.

The churches meeting at the Assembly (say the notes to the agenda) "must be alert to opportunities and frustrations in the awakening of peoples to national freedom and the growing demand for human rights. In the vast complex world of today men look for small social units where they can be at home. They look for political systems where they can find the security of law. They put their hopes in self-determination and democracy. At the same time we know the miseries of power abused, freedom trampled, and human dignity affronted. God calls men to maturity, and some use their freedom to deny it to others." The churches of the world must have a primary concern for human dignity and rights, and from New Delhi some wisdom should emerge for the guidance of individual Christians and Christian congregations.

But what most people expect from New Delhi is some fresh light on the pathway to Christian unity. Indeed there are those who quite properly claim that a World Council of Churches has no valid existence unless it is actively promoting the cause of unity, an undertaking which belongs to its life but in which it has to be careful not to usurp the responsibilities of its individual member churches. They, and they alone, are the responsible agents in this weighty matter. Two points about unity and the New Delhi meeting are significant. One, the Assembly is meeting in India, a land where the most significant union movement of modern times has been consummated in the Church of South India which brought episcopal and non-episcopal churches together and by all accounts is proving its worth. Other union movements are also afoot in North India and Ceylon which should be lively object lessons to delegates who seek to know what union and unity mean in practice after weary hours discussing in theory all the pros and cons.

The second point is that for the first time the Roman Catholic Church has openly and publicly appointed its official observers to an Assembly of the non-Roman churches. Observers have been present at previous assemblies, but partly in a personal and non-official character. But on this occasion, no doubt under the influence of Pope John and his new Secretariat for Unity, the observers, Father Guillou of France, Father Jan Groot of the Netherlands and Father Edward Duff of the United States, all experts in one form or another of church relations, have been named beforehand. They will be joined by two Indian priests.

It would be misleading to draw too much from this move by the Vatican, which always knows its own business better than anyone else. But at least it is a pointer to the fact that the Vatican sees the importance of the ecumenical movement amongst the non-Roman Churches, and is anxious not to be aloof from it, but to make friendly contacts and to be on speaking terms with churches that up to now it has hardly dared to call churches. What will be a signal of note is whether next year at the Vatican Council in the autumn of 1962 "observers" from the "separated brethren" are asked to attend its meetings. New Delhi, 1961, and the Vatican Council, 1962, cannot fail to register some advances on the long and stormy road of Christian unity.

## FORUM FEATURE—

## LORDS REFORM

DERYCK ABEL

**H**ALF A CENTURY ago, the Parliament Act of 1911 provided that the House of Lords should henceforth enjoy no power to reject or to amend a *money* Bill. It further prescribed that any *public* Bill passed by the House of Commons in three successive sessions (with or without a General Election) should, if rejected by the House of Lords in each successive session, be presented for Royal Assent, provided that two years had elapsed since the Second Reading in the Commons in the first session.

Its Preamble, moreover, gave due warning that "it is intended to substitute for the House of Lords, as it at present exists, a Second Chamber, constituted *on a popular instead of a hereditary basis*, but such substitution cannot be immediately brought into operation."

Nothing has happened since—except that, first, the expenses of peers are reimbursed and, secondly, the advent of life peers, men and women, has stimulated the erosion of the feudal hereditary principle. In May, 1915, the Liberals, then in their tenth year of office, brought the other parties into the Asquith War Coalition. In August, 1917, the ninth month of Lloyd George's Premiership, a three-party conference recommended that three-fourths of the House of Lords be elected by the House of Commons and the remaining fourth by both Houses. This project was quietly dropped. Ten years later, in 1927, Lord Chancellor Cave adumbrated a plan for representative peers—a fixed number of peers elected by their fellow-peers, together with a small number of Government nominees. This notion was also dropped—less quietly.

On October 31, 1947, the Attlee Administration, preoccupied, naturally enough, with steel nationalisation facilities and with the problem of the Lords' delaying power, introduced its Parliament Bill. Six days later, Mr. Clement Davies tabled a motion: "That this House declines to give a Second Reading to a Bill which, while amending the Constitution, retains the hereditary principle in the Second Chamber." In the Second Chamber, Viscount Samuel called for a three-party conference. He got it. The three-party conference opened on February 19, 1948. Among its members were the party leaders in both Houses: Mr. Attlee and Viscount Addison, Mr. Churchill and the Marquis of Salisbury, Mr. Davies and Viscount Samuel. (Others were Messrs. Morrison, Whiteley, Eden and Stanley, Viscount Swinton and Sir David Maxwell-Fyfe.)

Meanwhile, an official Conservative pamphlet had recommended that the right to sit and vote in the House of Lords should be restricted to such Lords as "are, and are likely to be, useful to Parliament," that the qualifications for service should be similar to those of the Scottish representative peers, and that life peers should henceforth be created—"on the recommendation of the Prime Minister of the day." Its authors had further opined that "to achieve such a state of composition requires co-operation

from all parties in agreeing in conference upon the change and in effecting it together." But, alas, the Conservatives were to bring about the breakdown of the inter-party conference—on the subsidiary issue of nine months' versus twelve months' operation for the delaying power of the Second Chamber.

Nonetheless, the parties achieved a wide measure of agreement on several of the broader issues. A White Paper of May 4, 1948 (Cmd. 7380), set out the conclusions of the inter-party conference. The Second Chamber should be complementary to—not a rival to—the First. "It should be reformed by modifying its existing constitution and not by establishing a completely new Chamber based on some system of election." (This language is infinitely less radical than that of the phrasing of the Preamble to the Parliament Act of 1911—37 years earlier—"... a Second Chamber constituted on a popular instead of an hereditary basis . . .") Furthermore, there should be no permanent majority for any one party. Heredity should not be a qualification for membership. Members should be appointed for personal distinction and for public service from among the hereditary peers and from commoners duly elevated to life peerages. There should be women Lords of Parliament. The Chamber should include certain descendants of the Sovereign, certain Lords Spiritual, and the Law Lords. Its members should be paid. Peers not members of the Second Chamber should be entitled to vote at General Elections and to stand for the First Chamber. All this was common ground—more or less. The Liberal Party Assembly at Hastings endorsed these principles by a large majority.

The Labour Government was willing to accord the House of Lords the right to a period of delay only three months shorter than that sought by the Conservative Opposition. This difference Lord Salisbury elevated to a "fundamental" principle. In the debate of June 8-9, 1948, Lord Samuel advanced five propositions. First, if the conference had settled the question of powers, it would have settled that of the composition of the Second Chamber with little dissension. Secondly, in rejecting the nine-month period of delay, the Conservative Opposition had erred, for the difference between nine and twelve months did not constitute a principle. Thirdly, what mattered was the change from an hereditary to a more representative Second Chamber. Fourthly, to reject the Bill merely meant that it would become law unamended. Fifthly, the Liberal peers would therefore vote for a Second Reading and would propose in Committee (were that stage reached) an Amendment, presenting the views of a majority of the members of the inter-party Conference and incorporating into the Bill the "not unreasonable compromise" suggested by the Government. However, by 177 votes to 81, the Tory peers threw out the Bill. In due course, the Bill was to win its Second Reading for the third time in the House of Commons. The date? October 31, 1949—less than four months before the General Election of 1950.

And there, save for two Macmillan reforms, life peerages and payment of peers, the matter rested until the Benn case. The hereditary principle, as a legislative concept, may be unconscionably long a-dying, but Mr. Anthony Wedgwood Benn and the electors of Bristol have hastened the

process. The case for a limit on numbers certainly does not need to be argued. Today the House of Lords numbers 906 (916 minus ten minors), of whom less than one-eighth are "journeymen". 250 would be ample. But how can we ensure that no one party has a perpetual majority, if reform of the Second Chamber assumes as its premise the rejection of the elective principle? Furthermore, we must reject outright any scheme that may be adumbrated for recomposing a Second Chamber according to the proportions of a First Chamber returned by an obsolete first-past-the-post system of election.

Should the Second Chamber be an Assembly of Nominees elected by Colleges of Notables? The Swedish is the most powerful of indirectly elected Second Chambers. Its 150 members, elected by the Swedish equivalent of the British County Councils, are returned for eight years, one-eighth retiring annually. Joint committees of the two Houses consider Bills before the Houses debate them separately. Even more formidable is the directly elected United States Senate, whose consent the President requires for his treaty-making.

Lord Ogmore argued forcibly in his article on "Life Peers" in the CONTEMPORARY REVIEW for April, 1961, that a Second Chamber must safeguard the interests both of posterity and of minorities—and that specialist opinion must be available to it.

Clearly the reform measures, agreed upon 12 years ago but torpedoed by the advocates of a year's delaying power, will fail to satisfy a new generation of Radical bent. In his essay written four years ago for the *The Unservile State* (George Allen and Unwin, 21s.), Mr. Jo Grimond declared: "All schemes for life peers or a mixed House ignore the fact that politics is not a matter of argument by good men but of argument directed to action; and action will only be effective in a democracy if it springs from contact with the people." It is, of course, precisely because it has nothing to do with democracy as such that the House of Lords is not everything that it might be. Mr. Grimond came out boldly for a *Second Chamber of perhaps 250 members elected for nine to twelve years in three blocks by Proportional Representation*. "This," he added, "would seem to answer some of the present needs: a more adequate representation of minorities would be achieved; some Independents and some distinguished figures who shun the Commons would almost certainly be elected; and members would be much freer from both constituency and party pressures. A member elected fifth on the list for Lancashire to serve a nine year term would be freer from pressure by both the cotton interests and the Whips (who would have no power to recommend dissolution) than a single member for a cotton town. Such a body could also be expected to take a considerable amount of work off the Commons . . ."

For my own part, I take my stand beside Mr. Grimond. The nominative principle is superior to the hereditary principle. A fusion of the elective principle with the nominative principle is better than the nominative principle *per se*. The elective principle, applied *in toto*, is better still.



## REPORT ON FRANCE—

## GAULLIST PROSPECTS

W. L. MIDDLETON

THE NOTION, favoured by the Government, that the rebellion of the Generals in Algeria last April was a brief incident interrupting the orderly progress of France under a beneficent Gaullism must now be abandoned. It may be said, with at least as much plausibility, that the crushing of the mutiny was only a fortunate incident which checked for a moment the persistent drift of conditions in Algeria towards disorder. For the rebellion and its suppression have been followed by an aggravation of the worst features of disorder. In the Algerian towns the European and Mussulman populations are more violently hostile to each other. The plastic bombings of the activists are multiplied. The strange organization (or group of organizations) which calls itself the OAS performs, besides its more violent acts, insolent exploits, such as the interruption of the Algiers radio for half an hour and the substitution of an emission from its own clandestine station on the same wavelength as the official broadcast.

The OAS, whose real importance cannot yet be estimated, obviously includes many civilian activists. It has military adherents among officers who took part in the Generals' mutiny, but did not accompany Challe when he presented himself for judgment. In his broadcast of October 2, General de Gaulle affirmed that in spite of incitements to disobedience the army remained faithful to its duty.

An order of the day addressed to the army by General Ailleret, commander-in-chief in Algeria, published on September 20, gives precise instructions as to the attitude to be adopted towards the OAS, beginning with a declaration that the activist organizations which have given themselves this name are in reality subversive organizations whose aim is, by terrorism and civil war, to overthrow the institutions of the Republic and impose on the country by force the policy and the will of a minority. While pursuing the fight against the fellaga rebellion the army must therefore give its help to the police forces in the work of neutralising the so-called OAS.

Officers of the professional army are by nature men of order, and these precise instructions cannot fail to bring back to the ordinary healthy rule of duty many who have lent a sort of passive complicity to the activist movements in favour of a French Algeria. It comes, however, after a long period in which complicity has been extensive, and at a moment when complicity is prevalent outside the army in many public or semi-public services both in Algeria and in metropolitan France. In Algeria the spread of disorder is such that some observers think they perceive a drift towards the form of anarchy which in Africa is given the nickname of "congolization". The drift is not easily controllable, partly because elements of the public services are not whole-heartedly loyal and the Government is not always sure that its orders will be executed.

In France itself the prompt suppression of the Generals' mutiny reinforced



the position of the President. But the fact that this successful action was not followed by the resumption of full normal governmental authority at long last threw a shadow of doubt on the efficacy of the Gaullist régime itself. Several incidents occurred to encourage the doubt. Two military officers sentenced to imprisonment for their share in the Paris plot which had accompanied the Challe rebellion almost immediately escaped, in circumstances which pointed to the laxity or connivance of police or other officials. A nest of activists was discovered in the south-west which should long before have been dealt with if the ordinary official services had been sufficiently watchful.

There is no need to exaggerate the political importance of these clandestine organizations in France. The clique of politicians in Paris, partisans of a French Algeria, who pretend ambitiously to be undermining the régime, are an ineffective minority, as was proved by the poor show they made in the referendum of January 8. The "strike" of the Parliamentary groups other than the powerful and faithful UNR Gaullists in protest against the neglect of the National Assembly, was significant, but its practical importance at the moment was limited by the unrepresentative character of the Assembly. The continued agitation of the peasants has a deeper significance because it is unquestionably a struggle for a higher status of agriculture in the industries of the country.

The régime has not been openly challenged by the expression of opinion on the national scale; the referendum of January 8 gave the same massive support to General de Gaulle as that which accepted the installation of the Fifth Republic in 1958. Nevertheless, the President's broadcast of October 2 was the speech of a statesman conscious of being surrounded by accumulated difficulties. He spoke in a tone of unusual urgency. He has chosen the position on which to make his stand. He is determined to carry through rapidly, in spite of formidable obstacles, the plan of setting-up a provisional administration in Algeria as quickly as possible. Its purpose will be to take over the management of internal affairs in a period of transition during which it will prepare the conditions of the referendum on the future political status of Algeria. The offer to the FLN to resume the negotiations interrupted at Evian and Lugrin remains open, and he appears to hope that the FLN will participate in the provisional administration. During this provisional period the administration, exclusively composed of Algerians, will have at its disposal a local force of order of 50,000 men recruited among the Algerian population.

General de Gaulle urged the French population to accept frankly their place in the new Algeria. If that should not prove to be the case their protection would be assured, either by their being regrouped in zones of security or, for those who asked for it, by transfer to France in conditions which would provide them with means of taking their place in the national activities. Having regard to the present state of mind of the French Algerians, the scheming of the OAS and the uncertain attitude of the FLN under the new leadership of Ben Khedda, the probable future evolution of the Algerian situation is by no means clearly calculable. One of the difficulties, external to Algeria but affecting the problem, seems likely to

be removed. The Franco-Tunisian dispute over the naval base of Bizerta is the subject of negotiation and a *modus vivendi* is probable.

To conciliate those of the Parliamentary groups which have lately become increasingly hostile to the Government and the régime the President of the Republic has abandoned the enormous exceptional powers which he had assumed by bringing Article 16 of the Constitution into operation at the time of the mutiny of the Generals in April. Article 16 is a most curious provision in a Constitution designed to organize and protect the system of government in a professedly democratic State. It leaves to the President of the Republic the right to declare the clause in operation on his own initiative after consultation with the Prime Minister and the Presidents of the two Chambers, whenever the Republican institutions, the independence of the nation or the integrity of the territory are imminently and gravely menaced. The President then takes the measures necessitated by the circumstances.

General de Gaulle considered that the menace of the Generals' mutiny met the requirements of the case, promptly announced that the clause had become operative and exercised the powers it conferred on him. The measures taken were brought into existence in such an exceptional way that they were not described as laws or regulations but by the indefinite term "decisions". In the intention of the framers of the Constitution, Article 16 was evidently to be limited to the duration of the menace and to the measures necessitated by the circumstances and not to become a continuous method of legislation or administration for a prolonged period. General de Gaulle on October 2 recognized, not too soon, that the Challe menace had ceased to be imminent and that Article 16 had been put to sleep, but he warned all possibly interested parties that the utilization of the clause remained in full measure the supreme guarantee of the country and the State.

Article 16, however, has played a part in the stimulation of the criticism of a régime of personal government. For a written Constitution, that of the Fifth Republic has given rise to some surprising differences of interpretation and also to some questions as to its apparent and its real nature. In practice, as might have been foreseen from the beginning, there are really two Prime Ministers, the nominal one who is responsible to Parliament, and the President of the Republic, who is not responsible to anybody. Parliament itself has so little importance that its remaining privileges are not enough to defend it against the executive. It is a curious aspect of the operation of Article 16 that so long as it was in force Parliament could not be dissolved; by abandoning it the President has resumed his power of dissolution. The fall of the Government can only be brought about by the passing of a vote of censure. If such a vote occurred it has been generally assumed that the President would retort by dissolving the Assembly.

This assumption is believed to act as a menace preventing many sections of deputies from voting a motion of censure. The President thus protects the Government against Parliament, but there is ambiguity in the relations between the two branches of the executive. Many important matters of

policy are practically reserved to be dealt with by the Elysée, which is staffed very much in the manner of a separate department. Algeria is the conspicuous instance of a subject reserved to himself by the President. On several occasions declarations of the President have been commented on by the Prime Minister in terms which suggested that the Prime Minister had two distinct attachments, one to his personal or Ministerial views and the other a predominant and unfailing loyalty to General de Gaulle. The actual functioning of the Government is a strange consequence of the modification of the Parliamentary system which the Fifth Republic has accomplished. Competent observers who have observed it in action have the impression that, however qualified individual Ministers are for their posts, there is no sense of collective responsibility. General de Gaulle, who presides over the Council of Ministers, partly to assure the continuity of policy and partly, if he so desires, to share in the discussion, may perhaps sometimes have the thought that he is alternately a referee and the captain of a team.

A survey of such a scheme of government leads irresistibly to the conclusion that it is in the end personal government. General de Gaulle has himself described his position as that of the supreme authority. It is said that in his draft of the Constitution, M. Debré conceived of the President as a monarch. The President, on the eve of a referendum, addresses the people as if there existed a moral contract between himself and the nation. In his mind this is perhaps the moral foundation of his power, superior to institutions. It is not an invulnerable political doctrine, because although one of the parties to the contract is a person who may hold steadfastly to his belief, the other party is a multitude.

In any case, a moral contract of this kind is no substitute for the relationship between people and Government which results from the permanent contact, national and local, which springs from representative institutions. At this moment Parliament should be a valuable intermediary between the peasant population and the executive. The peasant organizations have chosen direct demonstrations and conflict with local officials because Parliamentary deputies have become insignificant persons.

M. Mendès-France has launched a frontal attack against the Gaullist régime. The starting-point of his argument, stated at a press conference, is that the controversy about Algeria has reached a point where activists are intensifying violence. As violence inevitably calls for violence as a retort there is a danger of eventual conflict amounting to civil war. The Government, for all its claim to be the executive of a strong State, is less and less able to control the disruptive forces. M. Mendès-France's explanation of the weakness is its failure to use the immense force of national opinion by associating it as an active participant in government. One man does not take the place of a State by himself alone.

The Government asks for a passive adhesion of the nation. M. Mendès-France's campaign will have for its purpose the awakening of public opinion by bringing together men of goodwill in all active sections exercising influence—universities, trade unions, municipalities, for instance—

*Continued on Page 629*

## AMERICAN VISTAS—

## ANTI-AMERICANISM IN BRITAIN

H. C. ALLEN

THE CONCLUSION of the first year of the new Democratic Administration in Washington may be a good moment to take a fresh look at an old subject—the state of Anglo-American relations. And the topic, though well worn, is far from exhausted, for however much of a cliché it has now become that the future of the Western world depends primarily on understanding between the American and British peoples, it is—like so many clichés—still fundamentally true.

Many Presidents of the United States have known Britain well before they took office. Four or five can be said to have done so in the twentieth century alone, and before the Civil War an equal number had actually represented their country in London before becoming President. It might well have been possible for an informed and intelligent contemporary of these Presidents to predict their feelings towards Britain, at the time of inauguration, on the basis of their ambassadorships there. But 1961 was the first occasion, one imagines, on which commentators based apparently confident prophecies about a new President's views concerning Anglo-American relations on his *father's* ambassadorial career at the Court of St James.

On the premise that Ambassador Joseph Kennedy was anti-British, it was widely suggested that President John Kennedy was likely to be tarred with the same brush. (The premise itself seems to have been quite false: Mr. Kennedy Senior, Boston Irishman though he may be, appears merely to have been too affected by the pervading atmosphere of appeasement to have wholeheartedly believed in the possibility of a British victory when France fell in 1940.) This despite the fact, not only that the President has clearly demonstrated his undoubted independence of judgement, but also that he was himself for a substantial period at that time resident in London, and was even for a short period registered as a student at the London School of Economics. It might have been more pertinent for political sleuths to have spent their time trying to find out what effect this sojourn had had on the new President, then young no doubt but plainly adult. It is hardly to be supposed, for example, that any intelligent and politically-conscious person who knew anything about "the LSE" in the hey day of Harold Laski would leave England with the idea that all Britons were Tory imperialists, as some comment about the President's probable African policies has tended to suggest.

But judgements about this highly complex topic, the feelings of individuals about other countries, must never be hurriedly or lightly made, for any competent psychiatrist would warn us how difficult they must be. And such is even more the case when we ascend from the particular to the general and try to discuss the feelings of a whole people towards another. This is especially so with Anglo-American relations, because the one-time intimacy of association and the actual bonds of kinship give them some of the tension and tortuousness of family relationships, and because the

remaining, and indeed augmenting, ties of culture and language create a sometimes misleading impression of Anglo-American unity, if not identity. (Thus General De Gaulle in his *Memoirs* habitually refers to the two peoples as "the Anglo-Saxons".) Furthermore, feelings of mistrust, indeed hatred, between British and Americans—normally latent but capable of occasional eruption—can be the more dangerous just because they are usually repressed in the good cause of liberty, of which they are the joint guardians.

The particular aspect of Anglo-American feeling which is the subject of this article—the present state of anti-Americanism in Britain—has always been a subtler and more complex phenomenon than American anglophobia. The latter, after all, has habitually revolved around the simple, central sentiment of residual dislike by Americans of what seemed to them a tyrannical oligarchical imperialism. The former is a much more tangled and intricate sentiment. What may a candid observer, taking for granted the fundamental and vital ties of Anglo-American friendship, say about this British anti-American sentiment today?

From the very beginning in Britain, where opinion about the American Revolutionary War had been divided, the friends of the United States remained a pro-American nucleus of considerable importance. But this Whiggish influence was in fact very largely submerged for nearly half a century after 1783 by the Tory ascendancy resulting from the long struggle with Revolutionary and Napoleonic France. Thus "the Establishment" in the nineteenth century tended to be markedly anti-American.

This anti-Americanism was compounded at first of two main elements—plain resentment at the independence won by the upstart American colonists, and an aristocratic dislike of the democratic freedom and equality which the United States increasingly came to embody. As the nineteenth century passed and Britain itself became more and more dedicated to democracy, this latter element waned, and in due course disappeared from all but the most reactionary Tory circles, but resentment against the United States never really did. Rather did it take a new form—jealousy of America because, in effect in World War I and patently in World War II, it superseded Britain as the leading power on the world stage.

With this resentment there was entwined a distinct thread of British exasperation at American anti-colonialism. Because Britain's greatness had been in considerable degree associated with her Empire, there were Britons who felt that her swift relative decline was the result of its, to them, over-rapid dissolution. This disbandment, largely spontaneous though it in fact was, they tended to ascribe to American anti-imperialist pressure. There can be little doubt that the depth of British Tory animosity and the lengths to which Sir Anthony Eden was prepared to go in 1956 over Suez were principally the result of these passions.

They centred, it will be noted, in the Conservative Party, which had become, since the decline of the Liberals after World War I, the least anti-American party in the state. In the short-lived era of American imperialism it had fostered the rise of Anglo-American friendship on a common basis of "Anglo-Saxonism", but it had never acquired that

deep devotion to the great Republic as the torch-bearer of democracy which characterised British liberal thought in the nineteenth century. Tory thought, moreover, had lost a good deal of its pre-1914 pro-Americanism in its disillusionment with President Wilson's League of Nations policy. Even less was the new party of the left, the Labour Party, strongly pro-American, although some of its original members, reared in the radical tradition, had not at first been ill-disposed towards the United States. The reason for this seeming paradox is not far to seek. After the post-Civil War industrialization of the American democracy, it had become, by its own boast, the heart and centre of world capitalism. A socialist party of the working class like the British Labour Party, substantially tinged in parts with Marxist doctrines of economic determinism, regarded itself therefore as in a sense necessarily anti-American. It is true that, happily, the Labour movement has always been divided on this issue, and that the Parliamentary Labour Party—as the very reasonable record of the Labour Government of 1945-51 in Anglo-American relations shows—has usually behaved responsibly, but the most violent and consistent opposition to the United States in mid-twentieth century Britain has come from the extreme left. This, seen against the spectrum of international politics in the era of the cold war against Communism, is logical enough.

Indeed, it has been the cold war which above all else has provided the cement of Anglo-American good feeling since World War II, and which has kept anti-Americanism most effectively at bay in Britain. In the post-Stalinist era, with a Khrushchev anxious at least to give the impression of a desire for "peaceful co-existence" this situation has not been without its dangers, for it is from those on the British left who, either from naiveté or stupidity, fear Communist power least, that most danger to the Anglo-American relationship at present comes. The anti-Americanism of the Right in Britain has faded remarkably; the Suez crisis indeed acted to an astonishing degree as a classical catharsis, and purged Tory bosoms of much of the perilous anti-American stuff which weighed upon them. So, too, with a Colonial Secretary in Mr. Iain Macleod who had the bit between his teeth and, until his recent promotion, was dismantling the British colonial empire with all the speed that even its severest critics can well desire, Conservative bitterness at American anti-imperialism has waned fast. Mr. Macmillan's policy of "interdependence" between Britain and the United States has in fact succeeded wonderfully since 1956, and has helped to create a more broadly satisfactory Anglo-American relationship than has existed since World War II.

But the movement on the British left against nuclear weapons and in favour of unilateral disarmament which has sprung up in recent years, with its necessarily anti-American implications (for is not America the central missile arsenal of the West?), cannot yet by any means be described as a waning force. It was strong enough to gain in 1960, by a narrow margin, (though it lost it in 1961) a mandate from the annual conference of the Labour movement, even if it had never received the much more important adherence of the Parliamentary Labour Party and probably not even the support of the mass of the party in the country as a whole.



Furthermore, Mr. Gaitskell and many party and trade union leaders have fought a resolute and bitter battle against this policy, which might have meant that if a Labour Government gained office in Britain she would in effect secede from NATO.

It does, however, command deep and genuine loyalties among those sections of the British public, young as well as old, which have strong pacifist traditions, and is not merely a product of quasi-Communist forces, alert as always to exploit human gullibility. Even if a potent Communist tool, it is also a direct and understandable expression of human indignation at the prospect of living indefinitely under the terrifyingly immediate shadow of nuclear annihilation. (The time, after all, might one day come, even if it has not done so yet, when every rational being in the West might have to decide in his own soul whether even our fundamental liberties are worth the very real risk of the extermination of the species.)

There is no doubt that this movement for the abolition of her nuclear weapons by Britain, irrespective of the attitude of the other great powers, makes a powerful appeal to the idealism of some young Britons today. Because it is ingenuous, woolly-minded and alarmingly short-sighted, it would be a great mistake not to take it seriously, for it is but a short step from the demand for unilateral disarmament to a demand for the acceptance of the highly perilous Soviet siren-cry for universal and unconditional disarmament without effective inspection. Even the unilateralist policy has obvious neutralist implications, and if a whole new generation in Britain should ever come actually to demand of their government the total abandonment of nuclear weapons, we might find ourselves facing the gravest Anglo-American crisis for a century and a half. Unless, of course—and it is by no means impossible, for when such movements come in the United States they come with double the strength and at twice the speed of their counterparts in Britain—by that time a similar wave of pacific revulsion against this nuclear sword of Damocles had swept the American scene.

But active though the unilateralist ferment is among the young people of Britain today, there is very little sign that they—let alone their elders—are, as a whole, really likely seriously to contemplate any such frenzied act of anti-American import, for they do not share the anti-American reflexes of some of their parents. Indeed, quite to the contrary, it might well be claimed that British youth today is in essentials less anti-American than any generation which has preceded it. These young men and women have been born into a world in which the Anglo-American alliance is an existing, well-established, continuing fact. Before they became politically conscious, Britain's Empire had already been largely transmuted into the free association of independent nations known as The Commonwealth. They think of Britain only as a partner, and not the dominant one at that, in the affairs of the free world.

This realistic assessment of Britain's situation, however, is not the only advantage enjoyed by the new generation in their relations with America: they are not merely, in a negative fashion, liberated from much of their anti-American heritage. In politics they have many positive ideals



which they share with their American contemporaries; they are, for example, passionate believers in racial and social equality. Free also, as even those on the left to a great extent are, of the doctrinal attachment of their fathers to such dogmas of socialism as the nationalization of the means of production, distribution and exchange, they will find themselves in ready sympathy with a new Democratic Administration resolved to better the lot of those remaining Americans whom the prosperity of their country has passed by, as well as to try to bring succour to the poverty-stricken masses of mankind everywhere.

The younger generations in the two lands share more even than these political ideals. In the sort of society they wish to create, the kind of world they want to construct, the young people of Britain are—though they do not always realize it—to an astonishing degree Americanized. To one who has for the past 15 years moved regularly between Britain and America (and mostly to and from their universities, where the best of their youth are to be found), the conclusion is inescapable. It is not merely that there is a constantly increasing spate of new types of goods and material ideas eastward across the Atlantic; that as surely as a new commodity or appliance—washing machines, detergents, laundromats, frozen foods, supermarkets, dishwashing machines—makes its appearance in the United States, just as certainly it will appear, five years or so later, in Britain. It is that the whole desired pattern of living, in its broad outline and in many of its tiniest details, is profoundly affected by the American example; “relaxed”, “informal”, living is the ideal of democratic leisure in the affluent society on both sides of the ocean, and its manifold incidents in Britain all tend to bear an American trade mark. Jazz and jive, blue jeans and bikinis, hot dogs and hamburgers, radios and record players (there are no “wirelesses” and “gramophones” any more), the pursuits and the very vernacular of British youth seem in every case to have a transatlantic flavour.

In the clothes they wear, the language they talk, the pleasures they pursue, the homes they aim to build, the lives they seek to lead, they are Britain's first American-style generation. It is hard to see how they can ever really be, in the traditional sense of the term at any rate, anti-American.

---

#### GAULLIST PROSPECTS—*continued from Page 624*

to discuss the measures to be taken. The objects of these discussions are the bold practical proposals which M. Mendès-France puts forward. He calls for the formation of a transitional government for a period of two months, first to negotiate rapidly with the FLN a peace settlement in Algeria, and then put before the country precise proposals for the reform of its institutions.

*Pressigny-L'Orgueilleux, Par Vernon, Eure.*

## PROPAGANDA AND IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICTS 1917 - 1945

### THE NEED FOR PSYCHOLOGICAL PEACEFARE—I

BERNARD RUBIN

*Associate Professor of Governmental Affairs and Public Relations,  
Boston University, Massachusetts*

#### 1. PROPAGANDA AND DEMOCRATS

##### (a) TRUTH

"PROPAGANDISM", according to a scholar associated with the Committee on Public Information, the official United States propaganda agency of World War I, connotes "zealous campaigning to make ideals and principles take hold upon characters and prevail in public". Professor Stuart Sherman recognized that the American public distrusted professional propagandists and sought to show why our native practitioners were different from many of their foreign competitors. He admitted, at the beginning of his argument, that all propagandists are subject to great temptations. First, the propagandist is tempted to "become a wily liar, betraying the cause which he advocates by false emphasis, garbled reports and the suppression of evidence". Secondly, the propagandist is tempted to "become a blind and venomous hater of everyone and all things that oppose the propagation of his faith". Lastly, the propagandist is tempted to "yield to megalomania and natural egotism—signs of that madness which, according to the ancient proverb, appears in those whom God has marked for destruction".<sup>1</sup> Professor Sherman concluded that there was but "one valid justification for engaging in propaganda". In his view, the democratic propagandist must be engaged to defend ideals which are his own ideals to begin with.<sup>2</sup>

To carry the good scholar's proposition one step further—since the democrat worships the truth, he must, in the rôle of propagandist, deal in truth. As demagogues and hate mongers are unfit to hold posts as propagandists for democracy, it is likely that the responsible people in the field will make every effort to avoid the three temptations of the propagandist.

Propagandists for a democracy must be democrats. No amount of lip-service of the ideals of the free society can make an advocate of rule by force fit to hold such a post, because persuasion emanating from a sceptic, no matter how superficially forceful, will soon have a derisive effect. A democracy cannot hire a technician in idea dissemination who is not also an advocate of freedom. It has been noted that, "A communication cannot be viewed as an isolated stimulus automatically evoking a certain response. The surrounding circumstances make an enormous difference insofar as the response is concerned. If we want to predict the response, we have to consider not only the content of the stimulus (what the communication asserts), but also the predispositions of the

recipient and the perceived rôle and nature of the source."<sup>3</sup> Propaganda is symbolic of power; power in a democracy is responsible; to a free people responsibility is based on the respect for truth. Consequently, the truth is the best propaganda for a democracy.

#### (b) IDEALS

Perhaps no propaganda is as idealistic as that which is representative of the United States. We should remember the strong themes of idealism of those formative days when this republic was created and of the decades when individualism was manifested as a practical feature of American life. That idealistic tone, that mood signifying that men are born to be free, is an innate characteristic of our conception of government. True, dark forces of cynicism everlastingly try to penetrate and frustrate this environment but they have failed so far to divert the majority of the populace from the established habit of visualizing the good life in terms of individual good.

In the period of crisis surrounding our entry into the first World War on the side of the allies, Woodrow Wilson attempted to rephrase the ideas behind the cherished ideology and to apply it to the situation. The President, on April 2, 1917, asked the Congress for a declaration of war against Germany. That address, delivered at a vital turning point of a conflict initiated by competing imperial empires and undertaken by the rivals for the traditional purposes of national rather than popular ambitions, served to notify combatants and neutrals of America's high moral purpose in entering the conflict.

Several passages of his speech are now so much a part of our political code as to constitute basic slogans in the context of our aspirations. Sophisticated, even to the degree that we have become because of the terrors since that time, we still can thrill at the Wilsonian *elevation* of our reasons for fighting. This nation, alone amongst the great powers, served notice that it regarded with horror the tendency of members of the international community to utilize warfare as the method of obtaining petty objectives of territorial expansion or to satisfy other selfish ambitions. For our part, Wilson observed:

The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion . . . It is a fearful thing to lead this great peaceful people into war, into the most terrible and disastrous of all wars, civilization itself seeming to be in the balance. But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things which we have always carried nearest to our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own Governments, for the rights and liberties of small nations, for a universal dominion of right by such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free.<sup>4</sup>

The theme of political high-mindedness was repeated in Wilson's message to Congress of January 8, 1918, covering "the Fourteen Points". He reminded the national legislature that one principle, "the principle of justice to all peoples and nationalities, and their right to live on equal

terms of liberty and safety with one another, whether they be strong or weak",<sup>5</sup> ran through the whole of the programme he outlined.

## 2. THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC INFORMATION

### (a) BRITISH AND GERMAN PROPAGANDA, 1914-1917

World War I began with the excuse that a single assassination was enough to set the great European empires poised at each other in the terrible design of bloody war. It ended with millions of dead and millions of disillusioned as testimonials to the end of the old orders of feudalistic nationalism. Repercussions of that drastic change are felt in our time in frequent ideological shock waves that will directly influence the histories of many future generations.

As one consequence of the struggle, when Allied and Central Power political and military leaders concluded that defeat was as likely a consequence of their endeavours as victory, manoeuvring began to influence public and governmental opinion in the United States. Each side looked more seriously into the question of American intent as the conflict deepened.

If the benefits of American support were not to be secured, then the propagandists were instructed to do all that they could to keep the advantage from the opposition. Official American neutrality did not make this nation immune from propaganda campaigns directed this way.

Britain quickly secured the lead in the propaganda offensives by denying to the Germans and the Austrians easy methods for transmitting information to this country. On August 5, 1914, the British cut the cables between the United States and Germany. Our newspapers were obliged to rely on British sources for news relative to the martial progress of both sides. Also, the British were adept at intercepting wireless messages directed at or from German communications centres.<sup>6</sup>

In addition, the English concentrated on positive propaganda to reinforce censorship activities. By September, 1914, the Foreign Office authorized the creation of a *War Propaganda Bureau*, which, because of its location, became known as *Wellington House*.

Insofar as propaganda aimed at the United States is concerned, the British enterprises were far superior to the German. Apart from the language advantage, held by the Wellington House people, which gave them an important cultural lead over the propaganda people in Berlin, they had a host of other advantages—derived often from German shortcomings. (1) The German propaganda office in Berlin "dealt almost exclusively with propaganda in Europe". (2) The German Information Service in the United States never consisted of more than "a dozen men". (3) German intelligence services in the United States were inadequate. "Dernberg [Dr. Bernard Dernberg, the director until 1915] did not know what the American Government was doing, what the British Government planned to do, or what his own Government was considering."<sup>7</sup> (4) The American press was never an effective outlet for the German point of view. (5) After the sinking of the *Lusitania* in 1915, "there was no adequate German propaganda organization and the steps taken toward influencing

the American public were haphazard and disorganized."<sup>8</sup> (6) Increasingly, American public opinion turned to the position that the Germans and their allies were fighting against *the right* as appreciated there.

The English, on the other hand, managed to: (1) convince the majority of the American people that the Germans were villains guilty of atrocities during their campaigns; (2) develop heroes like Haig, Petain, King Albert, Cardinal Mercier and Edith Cavell to appeal to the American citizenry's sense of justice and courage; (3) instill on these shores the idea that Germany held the guilt for starting the war; (4) convince the majority of our citizens that the German Empire suffered from its dedication to militarism; (5) enlist the services of scores of well-known Americans for pro-allied publicity; (6) enlist the services of noted writers and artists of English nationality who were as well known in the United States to demonstrate the objectives of the cause which they usually signified was held in common with us.<sup>9</sup> In short, Britain triumphed in the propaganda battle which was fought to gain American goodwill and American participation.

#### (b) THE UNITED STATES ENTERS THE PROPAGANDA WAR

George Creel, the chairman of the *Committee on Public Information*, opined in an analysis prepared shortly after the conflict that the "Great War" differed from "all previous conflicts" because it was a "fight for the *minds* of men, for the 'conquest of their convictions'."<sup>10</sup> From April 24, 1917, the date that Wilson created the *Committee*, to the day that Congress abolished the organization (June 30, 1919—months after active work was discontinued), it existed as the first governmentally organized experiment to see if national objectives could be secured by propaganda. Even if psychological warfare was only primitively understood at the time and even if Creel saw his work as a gigantic advertising project, the fact remains that we had made our first national bid for survival by appealing to the "mind of mankind"<sup>11</sup> in a systematic fashion. Its domestic work is indicative. Almost every publication of the *Committee* reminded the American people, a people who still remembered internal wars and the Spanish-American situation as their great struggles, of the shift of our responsibility to the world scene.

Forget, for a moment, that we reverted to the old provincialism after the war and remember how important it was to be in the later crisis that we had been galvanized into thinking of the wider horizons. Prof. Evarts B. Greene, in an article prepared for the *Committee*, observed that "with the increasing interdependence of all the nations upon each other, the dominance of one type of government or the other is a matter of vital concern to the world at large. To those who think democracy worth saving in America, its fate in Europe or Asia can no longer be an indifferent matter."<sup>12</sup>

"The work of the *Committee* was so distinctly in the nature of an advertising campaign, though shot through and through with an evangelical quality, that we turned almost instinctively to the advertising profession for advice and assistance,"<sup>13</sup> wrote Creel. With his own professional experience concentrated in the field of journalism, it is small wonder that

the advertising approach would appear logical and useful. Wilson, prodded by Josephus Daniels and Secretaries Lansing and Baker to set up an organization to deal with "censorship and publicity",<sup>14</sup> an organization to handle the dissemination of government news with particular attention to the needs of the press,<sup>15</sup> beacons instinctively to a journalist who was first and last loyal to Wilson.<sup>16</sup>

### (c) THE CAMPAIGNS

A little more than a month after its creation the CPI was ready to issue a guide, a collection of suggestions on news, to the press. We find therein a categorical denial that censorship was to highlight the organization's work. Co-operation between the press and the Government was to mark the method of operation.

However, there were safeguards. For 53 days after the declaration of war, editors were legally bound by the laws against treason. On June 15, 1917, by the Espionage Act, and on October 12, 1917, by Wilson's executive order under the Trading-With-the-Enemy Act, teeth began to appear in the censorship picture.

News was divided into three categories by the CPI to facilitate its work: (1) "Matters which obviously must not be mentioned in print." (2) "Matters of a doubtful nature which should not be given publicity until submitted to and passed by the Committee." (3) "Matters which do not affect the conduct of the war, do not concern this Committee, and are governed only by peace-time laws of libel, defamation of character, etc."<sup>17</sup>

Under Creel's direction, the CPI expanded its activities beyond the regulatory function which it exercised over the press. Quickly, Creel realized that he would have to create propaganda to explain our war effort to the populace at home and abroad. Accordingly, a tremendous apparatus evolved. Some "250 paid employees" aided by "5,000 volunteer writers and artists and 20,000 public speakers"<sup>18</sup> were actively engaged by January of 1918. The CPI painted on a wide canvas. In its own words, it strove to convey "the meanings and purposes of America to all peoples".<sup>19</sup>

(1) Besides the daily war news, which it issues to the whole press of the country, it supplies some 30,000 newspapers with feature articles, a weekly news service, and governmental publicity material of all sorts.

(2) . . . prepared and printed for distribution to all parts of the world 18,000,000 copies of 15 different pamphlets in seven languages.

(3) . . . conducts speaking campaigns in every State . . . arranges meetings, books, speakers, conducts war conferences . . . organizes tours . . . in the Four Minute Men alone it commands the volunteer services of 15,000 public speakers.

(4) . . . wireless and cable news service . . . being extended to every capital in Europe, the Orient, South and Central America and Mexico.

(5) . . . sends to foreign countries motion-picture exhibits showing America's social, industrial and war progress.

(6) . . . mobilized the advertising forces of the country . . . for a patriotic campaign that will give \$30,000,000 worth of free space to the national service.

(7) . . . designs posters, window cards (etc.) . . . for the use of various Government departments and patriotic societies.

(8) . . . prepares moving-picture films showing our war progress.

(9) . . . issues an official daily newspaper for the Government, with a circulation of 90,000 copies a day.



(10) . . . keeps in touch with the foreign language press, supplying selected articles designed to combat ignorance and disaffection.

(11) . . . organizes and . . . directs a round of societies and leagues designed to appeal to certain classes and particular foreign language groups . . .

(12) . . . acts as a bureau of information (on) . . . volunteer war work, . . . knowledge of any administrative activities . . . approaching business dealings with the Government.

(13) . . . supervises the voluntary censorship of the newspaper and periodical press.

(14) . . . establishes rules for the cable censorship with respect to war dispatches.

(15) . . . prepares and distributes, advises upon and censors photographs and moving pictures.<sup>20</sup>

Information campaigns directed at home front audiences were quite successful in that the citizenry was made aware of the reasoning behind our national participation and of the immediate implications of the conflict. To be sure, the Wilsonian sense of purpose and crusade was felt by many irrespective of the CPI's work, but to the Creel group goes the credit for making the war meaningful to the majority of the people. In every walk of life individuals were helped to discover their own intimate relationships to the struggle. Patriotism, nourished by the information and persuasion programmes, was directed into channels of thought and action beneficial to the war effort.

Eighteen years before our entrance into World War I the populace strained to comprehend the issues of the Spanish-American affair, and emotional overtones clouded reasonable analysis. Before that internal affairs and the Civil War had tended to turn our eyes away from world problems.

Overseas enterprise of the organization was extensive. Tremendous energies were expended to convince all nations—enemy, allied and neutral—of our reasons for fighting. Propaganda programmes were directed at targets throughout Europe, through most of Latin America and to Asian areas. CPI representatives overseas in Europe were instrumental in instigating and/or organizing propaganda sallies against the enemies. Aerial propaganda leaflets attempting the demoralization of enemy troops, stories placed in the foreign press, smuggled propaganda materials, work with enemy defectors, and special films urging the American point of view upon foreign press and audiences, were all part of the overseas campaigns. Even in revolution-torn Russia CPI officials attempted to play up the themes of allied solidarity. From Havre to Vladivostok agents continued until months after the Armistice to broadcast the themes hatched in Washington.

It is obvious that the greatest achievements of the CPI were on the home front and that it proved the importance of governmental information services during times of crisis. Also, the psychological impact of its home-front campaigns was an important factor in maintaining morale and in building links between the individual and the Government in Washington. Very little of the available evidence serves to *prove* the effectiveness of the overseas propaganda campaigns. However, most analysts do give the CPI credit for making Wilson a symbol of democracy to the European peoples and it is likely that the organization was largely responsible. Still,



beyond that point one gets embroiled in estimates, made immediately after the war or later, which treat objectives as accomplishments.

One point is not in dispute! *The Committee on Public Information*, America's first modern propaganda bureau, worked well enough to make the conclusion irrefutable that our country was in the propaganda wars to stay—to win or lose by *commission* or *default*.

## FOOTNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Stuart P. Sherman, *American and Allied Ideals* (Washington D.C.: The Committee on Public Information, February, 1918), p. 4.
- <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 5.
- <sup>3</sup> Paul Kecskemeti, "Totalitarian Communications as a Means of Control", *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, Vol. 14, No. 2 (Summer, 1950), p. 227.
- <sup>4</sup> "Wilson's Speech for Declaration of War Against Germany", in Henry Steele Commager, ed., *Documents of American History* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1948), Vol. II, pp. 311-312.
- <sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 319.
- <sup>6</sup> H. C. Peterson, *Propaganda for War* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1939), pp. 12-15.
- <sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 136-137.
- <sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 141.
- <sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 12-70.
- <sup>10</sup> George Creel, *How We Advertised America* (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1920), p. 3.
- <sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 99.
- <sup>12</sup> Everts B. Greene, *American Interest in Popular Government Abroad* (Washington, D.C.: The Committee on Public Information, September, 1917), p. 3.
- <sup>13</sup> Creel, *op. cit.*, p. 156.
- <sup>14</sup> Josephus Daniels, *The Wilson Era* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1946), p. 221.
- <sup>15</sup> James R. Mock and Cedric Larson, *Words That Won the War* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1939), pp. 48-49.
- <sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 56, 59, 63, 64.
- <sup>17</sup> *Preliminary Statement to the Press of the United States* (Washington, D.C.: The Committee on Public Information, May 28, 1917), p. 6.
- <sup>18</sup> *The Activities of the Committee on Public Information* (Washington, D.C.: The Committee on Public Information, January, 27, 1918), p. 4.
- <sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.
- <sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4 (numbering mine).

*To be continued.*

## JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE USA

JOSEPH S. ROUCEK

*Professor and Chairman of the Departments of Sociology and Political Science, University of Bridgeport, Connecticut*

**F**EW SOCIAL PROBLEMS have received more attention or more study in the United States over the years than juvenile delinquency.

This is fully justified by the seriousness and magnitude of the problem. Speaking at a meeting of the National Council of Juvenile Court Judges in July, 1961, Senator Thomas J. Dodd (of Connecticut), Chairman of the US Senate Sub-Committee to investigate juvenile delinquency, reported, among other interesting facts, that: "In the last 10 years referrals of young boys and girls to the juvenile courts have risen almost 200 per cent; there has been a sharp increase in crime among the children of higher income families; a shocking rise in youthful offences in rural areas; an alarming increase in brutal, sadistic criminal acts committed for no apparent reason" other "than the mere desire for brutality and sadism." "If the present rate of increase is continued," reported Senator Dodd, "in the year 1970 1,500,000 juvenile cases will come before the courts."

The concern over this seemingly insolvable problem has influenced the White House. President Kennedy expressed this in his message to Congress, stressing his desire that the Federal Government make a contribution to its solution, although the primary responsibility for action rests in the United States with the states and local communities. This was recognized by the President, who advanced his five-year problem at the cost of \$10 million a year, and envisaged the rôle of the Federal Government as one of leadership in trying to get something done and in encouraging and assisting local and state officials to undertake programmes aimed at reducing the dimensions of the problem.

### THE ELUSIVENESS OF DEFINITION

The juvenile delinquency problem in America belongs to the category of social phenomena regarding which "everybody" agrees that it should be "solved"; and yet, it always seems to get worse in proportion as the steps are taken to reduce it or eliminate it. (The same principle appears to operate in regard to the universal desire to eliminate wars or reduce armaments.)

This is due to many factors; but one of the most important is that it is more than difficult to even define the problem.

Reduced to simplest terms, a delinquent child can be defined as one, who being under a certain legal age, has violated any law of the state, or any city or village ordinance. But this simple definition is thoroughly confusing when examined in the light of fifty state laws and thousands of municipal ordinances in America. In the state of Connecticut, for instance, a youngster under the age of 16 can commit no criminal act whatever. But in some other jurisdictions the same youngster is in trouble with the law merely by trying to marry without consent, in violation of law.

But such legal niceties mean nothing whatever to the average American, who has his own concepts of juvenile delinquency. To most parents, juvenile delinquents are other people's children who behave objectionably. To lawyers, they are minors who are accused of offences from which they are immune to the punishment usually administered to adults. To psychologists, they are youngsters whose social behaviour patterns show deviations from acceptable norms. To American court judges they are simply neglected children who have been brought into the world by parents who have turned their backs on their offspring and left them to shift for themselves, and are trying to break the vicious cycle in which delinquent children become delinquent parents of more delinquent children.

Furthermore, there is no difference, basically, between an explanation of crime and an explanation of juvenile delinquency. It has been only in recent decades that there has been recognition in the United States of the fact that crime has, often, its beginnings in the delinquencies of children; this has produced a desire for more scientific information on which to base programmes of prevention and treatment.

This approach, however, results in additional complications. As the number of laws, aiming to reduce crime increases, the possibilities of violations increase with them; the same applies to the insistence, sporadic at best, that "the laws should be enforced". Obviously, the better the enforcement, the higher the rates of recorded crime. The insistence on the passing of new laws against crime influence the statistics. For instance, the prohibition laws made crimes out of the liquor traffic; since their repeal, control of the sale of intoxicants has been relaxed and the consumption of liquor has been increasing. Crimes due to alcoholism, and especially the automobile driving under the influence of liquor, have been also increasing. But the sale of intoxicants as such is not a crime (unless sold by unlicensed persons or concerns).

Obviously the term "delinquent" can hardly be defined by "everybody"—except in its more specific legal meaning. Definitions can be found in the laws of the various states and of the federal government. While these reflect a wide variation both in content and degrees of discretion in interpretation allowed to law enforcement agencies, they are all, nevertheless, in agreement that delinquency consists of such behaviour of children as is detrimental to the public interest and consequently forbidden by law. In general, delinquency can be defined to include acts which, if committed by an adult, would be considered criminal, as well as patterns of behaviour which are peculiar to the status of childhood—such as truancy, running away from home, waywardness, sex immorality and incorrigibility.

#### THE CAUSES

In the popular mind there is a widespread view that the causes, and especially the *cause*, of delinquency can be easily pinned down and thus corrected. There is no end of such proposals as making all children attend school and churches and thus prevent them from committing anti-social acts. (But it is seldom noted that delinquency is often committed in this

institutional set-up or that the compulsory attendance in schools often leads to delinquency.) Or that children should not be allowed to roam the streets after dark, or be prohibited from working under certain ages (again producing the very conditions resulting in anti-social acts). Or that the old-fashioned beating, in public view, would be of enormous help here.

Yet all sociologists and police officials who have studied the problem are agreed that there is no single or simple solution, because there is no single or simple cause. What is necessary, above all, is to look beyond acts of a delinquent nature as defined by society to those conditions which create and foster a social climate conducive to and giving rise to such acts. Internalized problems which lead to acts such as running away from home, truancy from school, or incorrigibility, sexual offences, waywardness, violence, alcoholism or hooliganism should be placed in juxtaposition to changes in expectations and standards of living of the American family which now require employment of both parents, lengthened compulsory school laws and similar external forces which weaken primary parental controls upon the child. For instance, externalized problems such as auto thefts (in 1956, 54 per cent of those thefts were perpetrated by youths under 21) require closer scrutiny of the rôle of the automobile in American society.

Furthermore, why is it that the "causes" leading to juvenile delinquency in America show no comparable results elsewhere? UN statistics show, for instance, that global delinquency is usually at its maximum at 13 to 15 years of age, at a time when the child is particularly concerned with relations with his contemporaries. But in the United States, among boys, theft, the most characteristic offence, increases in all types (auto theft, burglary and unlawful entry, hold-up) from ages 10 to 16 years; truancy increases sharply beyond the age of 14; sex offence arraignments remain very low in all ages. Among girls, markedly different changes in the offence pattern occur with age. Stealing increases to the age of 12 and then decreases sharply, whereas ungovernability and running away increases sharply throughout the age range from 10 to 16. (The most complete record of arrests among young persons is contained in the *Uniform Crime Reports* of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, US Department of Justice, based upon annual reports by police in urban communities. These reports do not differentiate between children held of juvenile courts and those held for adult criminal courts, and to that extent constitute some degree of duplication for the 10-17 age group. They have the merit, however, of allowing a comparison between youth and adult offences.)

#### SPECIFIC "AMERICAN" CAUSES

Going on the assumption that conditions predisposing to juvenile delinquency are many in number and that they present numerous varying aspects, we can, however, endeavour to draw up a picture of the specific "American" conditions which have been giving rise to the seriousness and size of that problem in the United States. These represent a summary of research studies of individuals, groups and communities, some financed by

the federal government, researches focused on individuals, groups, neighbourhoods, community-agency resources, residential treatment centres, area projects, special services in schools, and the investigations of sociologists, psychologists, psychiatrists and social psychologists.

All conclusions feature the fact that the changing aspect of the American family is the major cause involved. Broken homes are far more frequent among delinquents than non-delinquents (although a broken home *per se* is not always serious). Evidence indicates that homes broken by death are not as likely to result in delinquency as homes where there has been divorce, separation or desertion or where the disruptive factors producing the voluntary break are great. Delinquent girls come from broken homes more frequently than delinquent boys, and younger delinquent white boys and Negro boys are more likely to be from broken homes than are older white delinquent boys.

Children of the foreign-born are more likely to come before the juvenile court than children with native-born parents. This is due to the universally accepted explanation that the immigrant's peasant culture pattern, transplanted from the "Old Country" into America's urbanized centres, produces the "marginal men", the children who, in order to "Americanize" themselves, have to try to overcome the parents' heritage, and lose on both counts. To all the social class disadvantages, identified with slums or "Little Italy" or "Little Poland" or "Hunkytown", the child has to face additional ethnic differences that set him apart from the mainstream of the culture around him; these two worlds are incompatible. Thus the ones who are best adjusted to their families in "Little Italy" are also the least likely to succeed in the larger American society; if a "rebel" reaction takes place—and it usually does—the painful repudiation of family ties causes the "passing Negro" or the "apostate Jew", and results in much anguish for immigrant descendants. Torn between conflicting mores, the child of alien parents is often prone to act out his resentments against the frustrating society, with the resulting induction of crime and delinquency. Thus also the Negro children in the cities, from the southern farming families, are referred to court far oftener than white children in proportion to their numbers; and bad housing and low economic status unquestionably contribute here.

Virtually all research shows that juvenile delinquents are an especially handicapped group; a sizable number are also mentally and physically below normal. The patterns of behaviour which are set in the family, the degree of courtesy, honesty and general consideration for the rights of others are very important in affecting attitude and behaviour outside the home; this also applies to deteriorated neighbourhoods and the economic status.

Then there are the personal characteristics of the delinquent. Many delinquents are mentally deficient, mentally unstable and troubled with "mental conflicts", thanks to such factors as being rejected, deprived, insecure, and feeling strongly, either really or fancifully, inadequate.

Then the total community factor is involved. Poor housing is a symptom of social and economic inadequacy and is likely to characterize the back-

ground of a child brought before the juvenile court. The improved recreational facilities have proved important in reducing delinquency. Crime and gangster movies and movies glamourizing illicit love have undoubtedly stimulated some youngsters to act in similar fashion; the same applies to comic books, the majority of them in America being full of murder, mayhem, and other violence. In certain cities, especially New York (and Brooklyn—read the famed novel, *The Blackboard Jungle!*), enraged and upset students have terrified teachers by their conduct; the dislike may be for the teacher, the course of study, the principal, or other classmates.

Then, there is an even wider framework, provided by the “climate of opinion” resulting from two World Wars, the periods when both parents were engaged in wartime activities and having the child in a world that had little place for children. The stress upon the ability—and the need—to consume material goods without any accompanying emphasis upon the ethnical and spiritual values of American culture is the whirlwind of the present generation. Then social mobility is a permanent characteristic of contemporary American society, producing numerous unattached and (at least temporarily) homeless persons.

Other factors can be added. But the author would conclude by propounding one very much resented and unacknowledged factor: that the United States is apparently the only country in the world where the children educate their parents.

---

#### “NEW OUTLOOK”

The CONTEMPORARY REVIEW welcomes a new colleague to the field, *New Outlook*, the Liberal colour magazine and digest, skilfully edited and pioneered by Donald Newby, printed by the *East Anglian Daily Times*, and published from Mitre House, 177 Regent Street, London, W.1. (Regent 0911).

A full-scale attack in the November issue on the anti-Common Market propaganda of the *Daily Express* was flanked by an exclusive interview with Lord Gladwyn on the future of Europe and an exposure, backed by chapter and verse, by Deryck Abel, of the “phoney” nature of the case for Empire Free Trade, *alias* Imperial Preference.

William Douglas Home wrote on Berlin, Geoffrey Taylor on Fall-Out, Susan Marsden-Smedley demanded a Government ban on dangerous oil-heaters, Heather Harvey appraised both Dutch and French Gaullist “planning”, and Richard Lamb launched an inquiry (of which more will be heard) into drugs, drug-manufacturing firms and the National Health Service.

Copies, price 1s. 6d. each, postage 3d., annual subscription £1 or \$3, are obtainable from the publishers (address above) and from all good newsagents.



## POST-WAR BUILDING IN CAMBRIDGE

VIVIAN I. GASTER

*who is Secretary of the Cambridge Preservation Society*

CAMBRIDGE is a small city of little over 11,000 acres and about 93,000 inhabitants. But it has a long history, starting probably as a road-river crossing with important defence implications, becoming a trading centre with its own local government, a university town, a market town and shopping centre, and a continuously increasing population—since after all it is a very pleasant place to live in. Its buildings include residences of the twelfth century and many others from the fifteenth century onwards; its churches date from the twelfth century, its University and Colleges from the thirteenth century, of many periods and many styles. Yet, as in any live city, it cannot exist as a museum, and changes and renewals are inevitable. Former generations were perhaps more subject to the allurements of the current modernity and sacrificed older buildings ruthlessly, whereas now more consideration is given to the desirability of retaining those which are, to use the current jargon, of special architectural or historic interest, and/or beautiful in themselves, even at some inconvenience and with some lack of modern amenities. Some of the callous perpetrations of the nineteenth century, when renewing or replacing older college buildings, are still appalling examples of accepting blindly current architectural fashions, and show what may happen even in a cultivated University society, when fashion rather than beauty and harmony rule the roost. The problem of renewal or replacement *versus* preservation is, however, almost always an important element in Cambridge building. It is, of course, not relevant everywhere in the city, since as one moves away from the older areas one comes (except where small villages have been absorbed into the city) to more modern development of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries of varying quality, but where interest on historic grounds is seldom likely to arise.

In a tour round Cambridge, I have revisited the various post-war buildings and newly developed areas. Let me confess myself somewhat unappreciative of the modern glass and concrete, and square brick boxes which seem to be the dominating architectural conceptions of today. "Functional" is a popular catchword and is apparently a justification for avoiding ornamentation of any sort. Curves are abhorred, in spite of the fact that they are part of man's aesthetic ideas from very early times, as witness the caves of Altamira, the treasure from Mycenae, the temples and paintings and sculptures of Egypt and Greece. I sometimes wonder whether I am being grossly antiquated in admiring a beautiful woman, instead of assessing her skeleton—provided, of course, that all the bones can be straightened out into cubes and squares! And in Cambridge, where there are the wonderful Senate House and King's College Chapel, it is more than usually difficult to accept these bleak novelties. If, however, the "functional" aspect refers to the use of the building, I can only say that it is sometimes not quite clear whether the building at which one is looking is a laboratory, a factory, offices or flats. Of course architectural



fashions come and go and new ideas in a new style from a master architect, who is revolting against the decadent styles of his immediate predecessors, must not be dismissed offhand; but they soon tend to degenerate into uninspired imitation and although a "renaissance" is sure to take place in due course, the poor buildings last a long time.

Nevertheless, I tried, in my tour of Cambridge, to look with an unprejudiced eye and I had to admit that in some cases the modern "box" style had its uses, and even merits, sometimes considerable. I do not intend to weary the reader with a catalogue of buildings, accompanied by an award of the appropriate "marks", but to try to give a general picture of what has been happening in Cambridge, with comments here and there. Be it noted that I am dealing solely with external appearance.

Turning therefore to buildings in the Government, Local Government and private sectors, one notices modern conventional buildings in the not over-inspired Post Office and Telephone Offices in Alexandra Road and Long Road; and some excellent new schools (in the modern style) by the Local Authority—airy, light and admirably suited to their purpose. They are a happy contrast to the old solid, unalterable Victorian and Edwardian schools and have the additional advantage that they are adaptable to changing requirements and can probably be entirely replaced economically in 30 years. Among the best may be mentioned the Boys' (Grammar) School in Queen Edith's Way and the very pleasant one-floor ESN School (Lady Adrian School) in Courtney Way. One or two later ones, however, show signs of working to formulae. In the world of industry, the Cambridge Instrument Company has built in Chesterton Road an extension to its existing factory, well proportioned in itself and in the good modern glass and concrete style, but it strikes a discordant note in the residential road facing the river. In the private sector there is the new Perse School off Hills Road, an amusing combination of many styles with an abundance of gables. It is rumoured that the architect was instructed that the new building should not resemble a Local Authority school, and if this be correct, he has certainly succeeded, though whether for better or worse may be a moot point. I may also mention the large offices at the junction of Station Road and Hills Road, the architectural merits of which are conspicuous by their absence; and the pleasant, variegated flats by Span, whose scheme originally contemplated a tower block of flats, and, situated as it would be so far from the centre of the town, was in no way objectionable, but this has I understand been abandoned on economic grounds. Finally there is the large Prudential shops-and-offices block of four storeys on St. Andrew's Street, north of Emmanuel College. They are mainly of red brick mildly pleasing in the older conventional style. Between it and Christ's College is a low two-storey-shop development, with an arcade leading to the main bus station in Drummer Street, good in itself but rather irrelevant in its context.

The really important building has, however, been carried out by the University and the Colleges. Ever expanding demands for more students as well as the necessity of overtaking arrears of work from the war years has forced almost every College to increase its accommodation, generally

by adding new wings or courts in College grounds, e.g. Christ's, Downing, Clare and Trinity, in most cases in a style according with the existing buildings. There are three College developments which call for special mentions. In the Benson and Mallory Court of Magdalene College, behind the sixteenth-seventeenth century buildings opposite the college gate, Mr. Wynn Roberts has reconditioned the old cottages, built new student rooms to blend with them, keeping to the scale of the area without monotony and in good relations to the long three-storey Lutyens building; and he has added a four-storey square building in the modern style with interesting variations and fenestration and a rather saucy and delicate railing on the roof. This is without doubt the most original and successful attempt to combine old and new in a real unity. The same architect has also built for Clare College a hostel off Chesterton Lane with a zig-zag front and plenty of glass, designed to catch the sunlight. It is rather too near the base of the Castle Mound and the upper storey and roof look somewhat incongruous against the edge of the Shire Hall grounds. Also the site is rather cramped. Even so it shows imagination and distinction. Finally, there is in Queens' College the new wing designed by Sir Basil Spence, closing the fourth side of Walnut Tree Court and facing towards the Backs (Queen's) Road. The happy mixture of brickwork, toning in with that of the Court, and of light stone relating it to the adjacent Bodley Buildings of King's College, is very successful; from the interior the view on to the green of the Backs through the "stilts" is delightful and the fenestration is varied and interesting. Nevertheless, I still think that there is an element of discord between its straight rigid lines compared with the softer and varied curves of the Chapel and of the older parts of the Court.

I should add that the prize for the worst building is easily won by the new kitchen wing of Emmanuel College at the junction of Emmanuel Street and St. Andrew's Street.

On the University has fallen the heavy burden of providing additional lecture rooms and laboratories to meet the increased number of students and the expanding demands of science. It has built Chemistry Laboratories (Lensfield Road), of little interest, Engineering Laboratories (Trumpington Street), of slightly more, and the School of Veterinary Medicine (Maddingley Road), an attractive, well-proportioned and rather under-rated building. The development of outstanding interest, however, is the Arts Faculties Buildings in Sidgwick Avenue by Sir Hugh Casson. The large lecture block, when first built, seemed too heavy and massive, but taken now with the long and lower adjoining buildings (on "stilts") leading to a transverse building, slightly higher than its neighbour, returning to form the fourth side of the quadrangle, it falls into place as the dominant point of the whole complex. The play of light through the "stilts" and also through the windows adds life and the varied patterns of the fenestration are of continual interest. The buildings are on a large scale, but they possess both dignity and proportion without stolidity. I look forward to the completion of the whole scheme and regret that for various reasons the land available has had to be reduced by three acres and that therefore some revision of the architect's original conception may be necessary.

There has been much house and flat building and the City has recently opened its 5,000th house. I cannot say that the quality of the architecture and the variety of these houses is strikingly original and the layout of some of the Council estates, notably Arbury Road, is poor, though I noted an improvement in the Barnwell Estate. Much private-house building has gone on, chiefly by building speculators, and with the demand in Cambridge and the inflated prices fetched, it is obviously a profitable business. Little of it is of particular quality or distinction either in architecture or layout, but there have certainly been a good number of individual houses which have style and originality. It is unfortunate that the Planning Authority has not felt able to insist on better standards generally. It is interesting to note the view of the Planning Authority in its Report on the Town Map accompanying the Quinquennial Review of the Development Plan, that there is ample land zoned in the "reviewed" Plan to meet all housing demands up to 1971 within the limit of City population of 100,000 (including 8,000 University students), laid down in the approved Development Plan.

Important buildings under construction are Churchill College, Fitzwilliam House, New Hall, the new Caius Court (in West Road) and the new Addenbrokes Hospital. Some are barely started and none are far enough advanced to justify criticism or praise. I would only say that the Addenbrokes Buildings, of which some are completed, are at present rather disconnected but give some hope of a really fine hospital.

On the other side of the picture it would be well to look at the disappearance of old buildings, valuable sometimes in themselves, sometimes as part of a group and sometimes simply as adding to the character of the city. They constitute a really difficult problem. The Minister has issued a list under Section 30 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1947, of "buildings of special architectural and historical interest", known as the Statutory List, and buildings thereon are classified as Grade I or Grade II. Grade I buildings are those which *must* be preserved and Grade II those which should be preserved unless there is a very strong case to the contrary. He has also issued a Supplementary List (Grade III) of those which it would be desirable to keep, if possible. No demolition or alteration of those on the Statutory List can be carried out without the permission of the Planning Authority, and notification to the Minister, and if it be decided that a building must not be altered or demolished, a Building Preservation Order can be made. This protection is, however, not entirely adequate as, though the owner may be prevented from altering or demolishing, he cannot be forced to maintain the building, and he can let it fall to ruin, unless the Local Authority decides to purchase it. So there is danger from an owner who wants to make a more useful or profitable development on the site.

The second danger arises from the Housing Acts, which require the Local Authority to make a Closing Order, if a house is not "reasonably fit for human habitation" owing to deficiencies under various headings, specified in the Act, such as damp, daylighting and so on. As the unfortunate builders of olden times did not have the advantage of knowing the require-

ments of the Housing Act, 1957, it is not surprising that their houses do not always satisfy them; they may not be able to be put in order "at reasonable cost" (to quote the Act), though they may be by a larger expenditure, which the owner is often willing to incur, if he can be assured of security against a renewed threat in a few years.

Both these types of cases have arisen in Cambridge. Of the first, I may quote the "Central Hotel". This consisted of a complex of four or five small sixteenth and seventeenth century houses, combined at the Restoration at latest to form an inn (The Three Tuns), the NE range being distinguished by a brick front of 1727. It lay between King's College and Guildhall, was a Grade II building on the Statutory List and was recommended by the Royal Commission on Historic Monuments as "especially worthy of preservation". It was used partly as a private hotel and partly, on the ground floor, as a bank. The interior of the hotel had been much sub-divided and was a regular rabbit warren, with a considerable fire risk. King's College owned it and decided that they needed the site to build proper student accommodation. They were advised by their expert that to recondition and adapt the existing premises for such a use would cost not less than £60,000, with no guarantee that heavy additional expense would not be necessary for maintenance. There was considerable public agitation in favour of preservation and another expert considered that satisfactory adaptation would cost about £20,000. The Planning Authority consulted the Minister, who decided that in the circumstances he could not object to the demolition, and the Planning Authority did not feel able to disagree and to incur the heavy expense of purchase which would result from a Building Preservation Order—which in any case the Minister was most unlikely to confirm. In the event, King's College decided to proceed with their plans and the Central Hotel, with its charming seventeenth century front along St. Edward's Passage and its eighteenth century brick front on Peas Hill has gone and its place has been taken by a modern building which most people in Cambridge consider a change for the worse. It is undoubtedly true that King's College could not have used the old buildings in their existing state for student lodgings and they were perhaps justified in preferring the opinion on cost of their own expert. It is possible that an alternative use, *e.g.* offices, *might* have been found, and this *might* have involved less expenditure; the building *might* then have been saved but the College would not have got the student accommodation which they so greatly needed. But the shade of Pepys, who is said to have "drunk pretty hard" in the old inn on February 25, 1660, may miss his old haunt! Certainly Cambridge is the poorer for its loss.

The other type of case may be illustrated in Little St. Mary's Lane and Orchard Street. The former lies on the north side of the Church of St. Mary the Less and consists of a terrace of houses varying considerably in date, style and accommodation, the earliest being the three at the western end, separated from the terrace, dating from the seventeenth century, the remainder being mostly eighteenth century. They form a delightful group, full of character, and are Grade II in the Statutory List. It is undoubtedly true that some of them suffer from defects, which could

bring them under the Housing Acts, especially the three at the western end, and these latter might well be made subject to Closing Orders (in fact, one already is), which could result in their going to ruin. Most of the owners are, however, prepared, where necessary, to meet substantial expenditure to put them in order. Orchard Street contains an early nineteenth century terrace of one floor and attics and as stated in the Cambridge Inventory of the Royal Commission on Historic Monuments, "the small scale of the fronts and the repetition of their features, the low eaves, the unbroken extent of the mansard roofs and the great chimney stacks produce a most striking effect, enhanced by the fortuitous curved layout of the street." It is a most interesting and attractive example of town architecture. It is also in Grade II. The architect advising the Cambridge Preservation Society considered that both of these groups could and should be preserved, though substantial cost would be involved. The problem is now how to get the money.

A happier example is on Honey Hill, Northampton Street. Until a few years ago this area was almost derelict. It is north of the river and west of the twelfth century church of St. Peter and is probably the site of the oldest settlement in Cambridge. The Local Authority decided to clear it and to build Old People's Houses, and in view of the amenity importance of the site, the Cambridge Preservation Society contributed £100 per house (£1,800) to secure better finish and materials. It made the condition, however, that the old house in Kettle's Yard, south of the church, should not be demolished and refused to waive this condition when later approached by the City. It felt it not unlikely that someone would see the possibilities of these houses and recondition them. The Society was right, somebody did come, somebody did recondition them and there is now a fine and harmonious building admirably set off against and setting off the old church. In dealing with these old houses there is much to be said for patience and still more against haste to destroy and build something else.

I end as I began. Cambridge is an old City, full of interest, architecturally fascinating in the style and beauties of its old buildings and yet by no means a museum, palpitating as it does with young life as every year new undergraduates come up for their three year stay. It is bound to undergo changes and renewals but the aim must be to keep all we can of the historic and beautiful past whilst also adding new buildings, of whatever style, provided they are worthy to stand comparison with it.

Unfortunately the post-war record is not entirely without reproach.

*Mr. Vivian Gaster's earlier article, "Planning in Cambridge", appeared in our November number. A few remaining copies are still available and may be obtained, price 4s. each, postage extra, from The Manager, CONTEMPORARY REVIEW, 42 Broadway, Westminster, S.W.1 (Tel.: WHIttehall 9101).*

## FRENCH PROFILE—

## MADAME DU CHÂTELET AND HER LOVERS

I. Maupertuis

G. P. GOOCH

MME. DU CHÂTELET was not merely the most celebrated among French women of her time but the most eminent woman scientist of whom France can boast. Not content to be the translator of the *Principia*, Emilia Newtomania, as she sometimes signed herself, produced a learned commentary on the text and published a treatise on physics. Her essay on fire was published by the Académie des Sciences and she corresponded on equal terms with leading European scientists. It is not these academic achievements, however, to which she owes her enduring fame, for this illustrious bluestocking was connected by the closest ties with some of the most distinguished men of her time. She warmed both hands before the fire of life, delighting in her abstruse mathematical studies only less than in her love affairs. Only of the last trio, Maupertuis, Voltaire and St. Lambert, do we possess sufficient knowledge to reconstruct her emotional experiences.

Born in 1706 into the noble family of Breteuil she was married at eighteen to the Marquis du Châtelet. *Mariages de convenance* among the nobility were arranged by parents without the slightest consideration for the wishes or happiness of the bride, with the natural result that after the birth of an heir to the title and estate husband and wife went their own way and were scarcely blamed for so doing. The Marquis was an officer without much personality, utterly incapable of satisfying the craving of his gifted partner for comradeship and stimulus. After the birth of three children, the eldest of whom lived to fall a victim of the Revolution, the mother left home and never dreamed of a return. While the children passed completely out of her life, tenuous contacts between husband and wife were maintained till near the end and brief meetings were occasionally arranged. There was no heartbreak on either side.

The recent publication in two volumes of the correspondence of Mme. du Châtelet by Theodore Besterman, Curator of the Musée Voltaire at his old home, *Les Délices*, in Geneva, opens the door into the depths of a woman's heart. The Introduction and notes of the erudite Editor of Voltaire's Correspondence guide the reader through the throng of men and women, celebrated and obscure, who crowd the stage. It is regrettable that the earliest letter dates from 1733 when the Marquise was twenty-seven and could look back on a series of amours. It is no less deplorable that scarcely any letters from the male side have survived.

The first known *liaison* was with Marquis de Guébriaut. Such partnerships rarely lasted long, and when it ended the discarded mistress attempted suicide. Maurepas records in his Memoirs that when the weary lover received her letter of farewell he hurried to her home, broke down the door and saved her life. She quickly consoled herself with other lovers, for in a loose age consolations were usually available. Before long a new attachment was formed with the Duc de Richelieu, the bearer of the proudest name in France outside the Royal Family. How long it lasted we do not know, but the frequent exchange of cordial letters proves that when it was over they remained close friends. The Marquise paid the Duke and Duchess frequent visits, and her letters to the latter are as affectionate as to the former. Was the Duchess aware of this early chapter in her husband's life? We cannot even guess. Some wives, like some husbands, are able to forgive.

Such attachments were far from monopolising the attention of the most attractive woman of her time. She was an excellent linguist, began a translation of Virgil, and enjoyed Milton and Dante in the original. Her favourite studies were mathematics and physics. Her scientific interests procured her the stimulating friendship



of Algarotti, a young Italian physicist and poet, who came to Paris in 1732 at the age of twenty, principally to see Voltaire, bringing with him his *Newtonionismo per le donne*. During the following years he visited Russia, was made a Count and Court Chamberlain by Frederick the Great and a Councillor by Augustus III, Elector of Saxony and King of Poland. His later years were spent in his native land, where he published a record of his residence in Russia and a treatise on painting. Frederick the Great erected a monument to him at Pisa. Since Madame du Châtelet knew little of foreign countries her versatile Italian friend brought a breath of Europe into her life.

The third significant *liaison*, so far as we know, was with the most eminent French scientist of his time. Born in 1696, Maupertuis was already a celebrity when their paths crossed. He had entered the army at the age of twenty, but his heart was not in his profession, and his spare hours were devoted to mathematics, physics and astronomy. Quitting the army after five years he speedily made his mark in science and was elected to the Académie des Sciences and the Royal Society at an unusually early age. A new chapter opens when the French Government invited him to lead an expedition to the North Pole in order to measure the meridian. His report made him an European celebrity and an honoured member of almost every scientific association. The most sensational discovery was that the pole was flat, and Carlyle saluted him a century later as "the earth-flattener". Among his other writings were treatises on the shape of the stars, the comet of 1742, the planet Venus, nautical astronomy and geography. Here was an ideal comrade for the student of Newton if she could win his affections. The task did not prove difficult. We do not know precisely when the *liaison* began and ended, but her editor believes that it lasted into the period when she was making her home with Voltaire. To possess two lovers at the same time, he informs us, was a common experience in the France of Louis XV.

The earliest surviving batch of letters is tentatively assigned by the Editor to January, 1734. The first breathes a spirit of discreet discipleship. "I felt that to be worthy to answer your letter one must have read you. I was pleased with your two manuscripts and I spent the whole of last evening profiting from your lessons. I confess I am afraid of losing your good opinion, for that would be paying too high a price for the pleasure of learning the truth from you. I hope that my desire to learn will make up for my lack of capacity and I hope I shall have the honour of seeing you here on Wednesday after the Academy." A second letter breathes a warmer tone and confides that her soul needs to see him as much as her body needs rest. "Come always, alone or in company. It would give me extreme pleasure and I shall await you." A third letter seems to indicate that they had become lovers. "No letters, no news, that's how you treat me. I've been waiting for you all day. If you will come tomorrow evening you will be forgiven. You know that in living with you I am thinking more of my pleasure than of my pride. So come and tell me yourself what I am to think of it."

If the Editor's assignment of the first group of letters to the month of January, 1734, be correct, the association must have developed rapidly and become the main spring of her life. "I don't want to reproach you Sir," we read, "for not having returned the evening of the day before yesterday, and I feel I must not abuse your kindness. I have worked hard and I hope you will be less dissatisfied with me than last time. If you will come and judge for yourself tomorrow I shall be infinitely obliged. I show you my gratitude tomorrow." The next note contained only two sentences, but they tell their own tale. "I beg you to come. I am ill and I have a thousand things to tell you."

The next letter assures her teacher that she would feel she was committing an irreparable crime if she went to bed without writing the letter for which he had asked. "I beg a thousand pardons for not having done so sooner. You must surely

know how I enjoy doing something to give you pleasure and express what your friendship means to me." The last of the January letters informed him that she had spent the evening with her mathematics but could not advance unless he set her a task. She had to leave home on the morrow at six, but if he came at four they could have two hours of study.

After an interval of three months she informed him that she was returning to Paris and expected to see him unless he was of all men the least aware of the claims of friendship. A letter of the same month conveys the first hint of jealousy: perhaps she was not the only woman with a latch key to his heart. Absence aroused anxiety. She always seemed to see Mme. de Lauraguais practising a thousand coquetties which she feared he was too little of a philosopher to resist. She expected to be in Paris early in June, when she flattered herself she would be less unworthy of his lessons. "It is no longer for myself that I want to be a mathematician; it is for your reputation. A pupil of yours cannot be permitted to make such poor progress, and I cannot tell you how ashamed I am."

The same letter contains the first of many mentions of her other distinguished friend, Voltaire. "I told him I was writing to you and he sends his greetings. He is worried, and with good reason, about the fate of his *Lettres sur les Anglais*. He was flattered by the charge of his enemies that you had a part in the one on Newton, and were it not for the *lettre de cachet* your approbation would make up for everything." At the close of the same month she reported that she was doing little work and had brought none with her. "I warn you that I shall reach Paris on Sunday and it would be nice if you come to supper."

It was to Maupertuis that she turned when Voltaire was in danger. "Your friendship, Sir," she wrote on August 6, "has been the charm of my life in my happiest days, that is, when I often saw you, so you will understand how I need it in misfortune. I have just lost Voltaire. He has decided to seek abroad the peace and consideration so unjustly denied him in his own country. His departure makes me very sad. I doubt if the claims of friendship will bring him back to a land which treats him so unjustly. Your friendship and esteem will make up for a lot of foolish criticisms, but nothing can take the place of your personal contacts. I am sure you will be touched by the fate of such a kind and extraordinary man. We must hope that when the hatred of his enemies is satisfied people will do justice to his talents which hitherto have only brought him trouble. You lose in him one of your greatest admirers. He hopes you will soften the rigours of exile. When he has chosen where to live he will write to you direct." She did not know where he was. She had not heard from him, hoped he had gone to Basle or Geneva, and was worried about his health. "His affairs are going very badly. His book is being denounced to the Parlement and there is a definite plan to destroy him. I am terribly afraid he is gone for ever. He will find his fatherland everywhere, and I confess I would rather see him in Switzerland than in France. If justice existed there would be no trouble about his book, but it was judged before it was denounced and it was the author, not the book, that was condemned."

The next letter, a week or two later, was much more cheerful. Voltaire's affairs had improved, and now that he was less unhappy she was less preoccupied with him and she had returned to her geometry. "You will find me exactly where you left me," she reported to Maupertuis. "Neither better nor worse, having neither learned nor forgotten anything, and equally eager to be worthy of my master. You sow flowers where others only find brambles. You know how to embellish the driest subjects, without depriving them of their precision. I felt what I then should lose if I did not take full advantage of your kindness in teaching me sublime things as if it were a game. I shall always have the advantage of having studied with the kindest as well as the most profound mathematician in the world."

A month later, in July, she reported to Maupertuis that she was returning to

Paris and it would be nice if he came to supper. "You owe me this in repair for your offences. When several days pass without seeing you I feel very low". In August she wrote to tell him of the death of her son and the grief it caused her. Would he come and console her? Her door, of course, would be closed to everyone else.

The only September letter chides him, not for going to Basle, where he had an engagement, but for not telling her he was leaving for Basle. A letter written from Cirey in October to Basle is the usual blend of pleasure and dissatisfaction. "So at last you have thought of me, I have had a letter from Basle when I had ceased to expect one. I was beginning to hate geometry, and that would have been doing you injustice. I am absolutely alone, but I don't mind. I divide my time between the builders and Locke, for, like other people, I want to get to the bottom of things. I am arranging my hermitage in the fond hope of passing years of philosophising with you. One merely has to spend some time in the capital to be fed up; that is all one gets from society. With you it is different. You can find the meaning of things but I shall never be able to discover the secret of your mind and your charm." As he had enquired about Voltaire she replied that his case was going better than his health. She hoped he would be in Paris by Christmas: if so he would have an opera and a tragedy ready for them. She was too optimistic, for permission to return was not received till the spring of 1735.

A batch of letters at Christmas, 1734, pictures the Marquise enjoying the company of Maupertuis in Paris. "I would rather be at Cirey and you at Basle than see as little of you as I do. I should like to celebrate Christmas with you. Won't you come and drink to the Saviour's health with Clairant and me? I shall expect you between eight and nine. Then we will go to midnight mass to hear the organ, and then I will bring you to your home." A week later she cried that it would be a bad start to the new year if she did not see him. Another note declared that she did not wish to make advances but that she would like to make such use of their friendship as he approved. It was a blow to learn in the spring of 1735 of the prospect of a lengthy separation. "Maupertuis is going to the pole to measure the earth," she wrote to Richelieu, "He says he won't stay in Paris when I am gone. He is disgruntled which makes him very unhappy. His heart needs occupation more than his head. Unfortunately it is easier to make calculations than to be in love." To Maupertuis she wrote from Cirey, "You are going to freeze for the sake of glory; Voltaire and I are drinking your health. He says he would like to be the poet of your expedition, but it is too cold there. We shall see if you will visit us on your return. I know your imagination will not be chilled by polar ice, but I am not so sure about your friendship for me." She still loved him, but could she trust him? In the autumn she added: "I must love you passionately not to hate you after all the wrong you have done me".

No letters survive from the winter of 1735. Contact was renewed in April, 1736, when they were both in Paris. "I have not heard anything about you for six months and I was expecting to read about your departure in the papers. I shall always follow your doings with interest, my esteem being stronger than your reserve. Voltaire sends a thousand tender greetings. You wished to lessen my regret at your departure, but without success. I hope you will write."

Three months later she wrote to inquire how he liked the Lapps, adding that a visit to Cirey would have brought him less glory but more pleasure. "I was about to pardon your silence and all your misdeeds when I heard the terrible news from Paris that you have left me for the Duchesse de Richelieu, who loudly boasts of it. For you it is a gain, for she is surely a pupil who will do you more honour and is more capable of profiting by your lessons. She cannot be more grateful than myself. I hope she will remember that you owe me your acquaintance with her." At the end of 1736 she complains that all his letters to Paris are full of praise for the

Lapp women. "Perhaps one in particular, you can tell me frankly. Tell me when you will be back. The residents at Cirey are busy trying to be worthy of you, for they still hope to see you here some day. We have become quite *Philosophes*. My companion in solitude has written an Introduction to Newton's philosophy which he dedicates to me. I have the advantage over the greatest *Philosophes* in having had you for my teacher."

Maupertuis returned to France amid acclamations. "At last, Sir," wrote the Marquise in September, 1737, "you are back from the other world. I should have expressed my joy sooner if I had thought you would have time to read my letter. I know you are fêted and much in demand, with so many people asking you questions, that I won't ask you any. I hope you have returned in good health and with a little friendship for me. I will send a carriage for you." "Everyone talks to me of your success, of the way you have instructed the Academy and the public," she writes at the close of 1737, "However pleasant it is to hear everyone singing your praises and paying you the tribute of admiration which I have paid you ever since I have known you, it would be still better to hear of your successes from yourself. Please send your Memoirs to Cirey. Voltaire, who likes and esteems you more than anyone, asks me to beg for them. If we could think of attracting you to Cirey we might say you would find *Philosophes*."

At the opening of 1738 she wrote to Algarotti: "Doubtless you know of the expedition of Maupertuis, of the beauty and precision of his operations which have exceeded his hopes. His trials are worthy of Charles XII. His reward has been persecution by the old Academy, Cassini and other Jesuits. They have persuaded silly folk that he does not know what he is talking about and half Paris, even three quarters, believes them. He has had endless difficulty about publishing the report of his journey, and I am not sure if he will succeed. They don't want Newton to count in France, and they are afraid that Voltaire and Maupertuis working together may exert complete domination."

It was hard to see error triumphant and that his only reward of his endeavours was contradiction. Perhaps worse was to come. "I should not be surprised if the Parlement launched a decree against Newton's philosophy and against you. Since the *Eléments de la Philosophie de Newton* is not permitted publication in France we shall be treated as heretics in philosophy. Sometimes I welcome the attacks on you because it will mean a visit from you. I am sure you will be happy. Now you are a great man the only thing lacking was a cabal against you and Voltaire." Her feelings for him could not increase, and Voltaire and her husband were looking forward to his visit. A month later she wrote that she was striving to become worthy of him, and she hoped he would feel so happy at Cirey that he would not want to leave. They would do their utmost to keep him, Voltaire was eager for his visit. Her husband hoped to see him in Paris in a few days and to bring him to Cirey. Nowhere would he find such friendship and admiration.

There is no evidence in the correspondence that the visit was paid, and the surviving letters of the Marquise throughout 1738 dealt mainly with scientific themes including her treatise on fire which was published by the *Académie des Sciences*. There were also the usual expressions of disappointment at his failure to pay the visit to which she believed him to be honourably pledged. A letter in October was full of reproaches. "I have been awaiting you for a year and I see no reason to prevent your fulfilling your promises. I flatter myself that your reply to this letter will announce me the date of your departure." A visit took place at last in the winter of 1738-39, for a letter of January, 1739, began with the assurance that nothing could console her for his absence except the pleasure of writing to him. "Tell me about your journey and above all of your return. If you don't keep your promised word I shall never cease to reproach myself for having let you go. Voltaire asks

me to say that no one admires and likes you more than himself, but I know someone who would dispute his claim."

A letter in August, 1740, contained the bitterest complaints she had ever uttered, the reason for which we do not know. "I can neither love by half nor be reconciled by half. I have given you my whole heart and I count on the sincerity of yours. I haven't concealed my grief at being obliged to renounce my friendship for you, and I confess to the pleasure it gives me to do so. You have made me feel how cruel it is to be forced to complain of somebody one would like to love and cannot help esteeming." The second paragraph is in striking contrast with the first, as if she was repenting of her harsh words before the ink was dry. "Henceforth I hope for the pleasure of a friendship without storms. Mine for you is not weakened. No one will ever have a more sincere esteem for you or a more inviolable and tender friendship." She concludes with congratulations on his forthcoming visit to *Frédéric Marc Aurèle* for which the invitation had been procured by the good offices of Voltaire. Her next letter expressed her delight at his reception at Potsdam, where he was appointed President of the reconstituted Prussian Academy of Science and became one of the luminaries at the Round Table of the young ruler where Voltaire was the brightest ornament. She sent her treatise on physics to the *Roi Philosophe*, though she hardly expected him to read it. Monarch and bluestocking exchanged several letters, but her hope that they might meet one day was never realised.

When Maupertuis accepted Frederick's invitation he could not guess that within a year he would be a captive in Austria after a battle to which he had accompanied his friend and patron. Madame du Châtelet's letter of sympathy is couched in warm terms: "If you had witnessed my emotions the last week you would value my friendship at its proper price and would give me yours. I mourned you as dead, and now I learn with inexpressible joy that you are safely at Vienna. I feel sure you will receive the esteem and consideration which your merits and reputation procure for you everywhere. You will find a Queen who owns the heart of her people and whom those who know her well adore. Send me news, I beg you, and count on my friendship which nothing has been able to destroy and which will last as long as I live." A month later she expressed her pleasure that he was back in Berlin and in good health and had decided to return to France. Berlin would be a sad place without the King. Paris was becoming more and more worthy to possess him. Though they did not meet on this occasion she continued to consult him about scientific problems.

Only one short letter later than 1741 survives and that after an interval of three years. The tone is so warm that we may rule out any idea that the lack of letters was due to a breach. "I shall be delighted if I find you in Paris on my return," she concludes, and "if you give me the chance of seeing you often and assuring you of my constant friendship." A year later, in 1745, Maupertuis wrote to inform her of his marriage to one of the Queen's ladies, "a very honourable though by no means lucrative marriage". He seemed very happy and she hoped he would have children. A year later, in September, 1746, the two old friends met in Paris on the occasion of his father's death. She found him very sad for he loved his father. They probably never met again as in 1744 he had returned to Berlin at the invitation of the King. The time was long past when the Marquise craved for his visits and letters, and in the last phase of her life she had no thought but for Saint-Lambert, the last of her lovers.



## THEATRE—

## A LITTLE MADNESS IN THE "METHOD"

REID DOUGLAS

LONG before I left for New York there was argument about "Method" acting. Newspapers made fun of it. Film and theatre critics complained of it. And everyone I knew who had ever heard of Stanislavsky was ready to explain *exactly* what it was. I imagined that by the time I arrived in America the shouting would have died and, with it, the "Method"; I expected to study the remains of an extinct monster. Instead I found myself watching something still very much alive.

First let's be quite clear that "Method" theories are not something mysterious and obscure. Neither are they a new technique which is either practised or not practised by every up-to-date actor. The "Method" is, quite simply, another approach to the problem of actor training. The one criterion by which it can be judged is whether or not it trains actors well.

It was begun, of course, by Constantin Stanislavsky. His theories were particularly attractive to the American Group Theatre which flourished during the thirties. This company's training programme was based on translations of Stanislavsky's two books. So began the "Method" as it is found in America today. How accurate the original translations were, and how much the leaders of the Group Theatre unconsciously adapted his theories, are interesting questions. Certainly there was a marked change of emphasis. The Group was made to realise this when Stanislavsky himself suggested considerable modification in its approach to actor training.

It was significant that the Group Theatre's reputation was made by actors who were already established professionals before their contact with this form of the "Method". This pattern was to repeat itself after the war when several members of the defunct Group Theatre founded the Actors' Studio.

This is not a drama school in any usual sense. There is no set curriculum, no examinations, no graduation. Rather it is a continuing refresher course for experienced actors who wish to extend their training. It was not designed for beginning actors; the members of Actors' Studio are seldom younger than their middle twenties.

In the early days one of the youngest members was Marlon Brando. He was already an experienced professional and had behind him a long period of formal training for his craft. His spectacular success as star of *Street-Car Named Desire* turned the spotlight on other professionals who were studying and teaching at the Studio. Quite suddenly any reference to the Actors' Studio became news. And the legend of "Method" acting had begun.

Ten years later, by the time I reached New York last year, every large acting school there was basing its programme on "Method" training. It was no longer regarded as something for older actors but was being sought after by students with no basic stage-craft and little experience. The difference is an important one: the actors who have absorbed "Method" theories successfully have always had a great deal of experience behind them first. The original Moscow Art Theatre, the American Group Theatre and the members of Actors' Studio had found this approach stimulating—but for a beginning actor it is often just the opposite.

New York theatre at this moment is trying to absorb a whole generation of young actors whose training has hindered rather than helped their talent. And because many of the professional acting schools have begun to offer short courses to amateur producers and College drama teachers, "Method" theories have very wide currency.

Young actors who have come into contact with this sort of training can present their producers with enormous problems when they come to be rehearsed. Certainly rehearsals are no place to be re-learning basic technique. The notorious inaudibility of "Method" trained actors has long been a joke in the profession. It is something less than a joke when you lose much of what an actor is saying after paying American



prices for a theatre seat! But "Method" training seldom concerns itself with voice, with making an entrance, with standing or sitting or walking. Or with the necessity of emotional projection to the back rows. These things can be taken for granted when dealing with experienced actors. But the New York acting schools are dealing with beginners.

In practice "Method" training puts little emphasis on performing a rôle in front of an audience. Even at a student performance at the end of a term the evening will tend to be little more than a series of unrelated "Method" exercises. The student spends much of his time with this abstract acting and mime. There will be much talk of memory and experience. The actor is repeatedly encouraged to "Look backwards" into his own early experiences and to "Look inwards". Hours of exercises will be spent each week in developing such attitudes. Students will often be occupied with work which more closely resembles Group Psychotherapy than anything which is going to be useful in a theatre. All these things come less from Stanislavsky than from Freud.

It is these marked Freudian overtones in American "Method" which foster a preoccupation with the abnormal rather than its opposite. In some rôles this is going to help the actor. Indeed this is the area where members of the Actors' Studio have had their most spectacular success. But a bias of this kind can reduce every characterisation to a neurotic who shakes, jiggles and twitches his way through a performance. This mannerism is currently weakening much of the acting of my own generation in America.

"Method" training then has been useful to some experienced actors. But it can be crippling for others.

What influence has "Method" had in England? It is certainly discussed a great deal and one or two small "Method" schools have been started. It is commonly regarded here as a type of acting rather than another form of actor training.

English training for actors is much more traditional in concept than the American and is the stronger for it. In America the dominant influence in acting schools is Actors' Studio. Because it is not a school, and because it was not designed for beginning actors, it sets a confusing example to follow.

In England the picture is rather different. The one or two leading schools here carefully audition all applicants and are in a position to refuse the untalented. Because in these schools the curriculum is designed for inexperienced but talented actors the influence they have on other schools and teachers is a more useful one than that of Actors' Studio in New York.

The emphasis in England is very much on more experience in acting, preferably in front of an audience. This may be the oldest approach to the problem of actor training; it is also probably the wisest. Voice, fencing and dance are given as part of the whole physical training useful to an actor. In America these things tend to be the student's own responsibility—in which he may take extra work from outside coaches.

In England there is a much greater emphasis on basic technique. But surprisingly this is an advantage which is most often criticised here. In practice it is better for the young actor to have a firm grasp on basic technique than any number of confusing and impractical theories. The humanity, the reality of the acting, will follow with sufficient experience. Formal training of any sort invariably causes a certain self-consciousness in the young actor. But, like measles, if it is unavoidable in the young, it is also temporary.

I hope the conclusions from these notes are obvious. American standards of production and staging, American standards of serious theatre are all admirable. But current standards there of actor training have little to commend them. Conversely, the standards of training here, and the results which grow from them, are something of which to be a little proud.

## SPECIAL REPORT—

## THE GREEK ELECTIONS

THOMAS ANTHEM

WHEN every allowance is made for whatever element of truth there may be in the allegations of Mr. George Papandreou, veteran Liberal leader, that pressure was brought to bear on voters in the Greek General Election, Mr. Karamanlis' victory was of such a landslide character as to leave no doubt that the people had registered a vote of complete confidence in his policies.

The figures themselves reveal this. Mr. Karamanlis had bowed to the will of the opposition parties and revised the system of voting so as to give expression to his own desire for a reliable nationalist alternative government to take over. "should an unexpected emergency arise." If the parties of the Centre Union hold together, this, one may say, is just the result that has been achieved, for with 100 seats in the new Boule—the Government's strength is 176 seats, with an overall majority of 52—they now constitute the official Opposition, having ousted the extreme Left, EDA (now PAME). Crypto-Communists have been reduced to 24, against 58 gained in the 1958 elections, although on the present occasion the voting system was more in their favour.

So doughty a critic of the Government as the Centre newspaper *Eleftheria* admits that the elections were held in "an atmosphere of calm in the capital." This may be said of the other Greek cities and towns where everyone could see what was going on, and where few or no incidents of "coercion" were reported. But *Eleftheria* made reservations about the provinces, repeating statements of some Centre candidates that there "democracy had been completely abolished." The answer given by *Athens News*, the Greek-owned daily printed in English, is reasonable and acceptable: "With regard to the rural areas, we can say that even if a few sporadic acts of violence were committed by some stupid and fanatic policemen or militia, this could not have affected the results, since ERE (National Radical Union) won by a landslide." Whilst Mr. Karamanlis' party actually increased its vote in the cities, where one would expect Communism to be on fruitful soil, farmers and peasants felt no glow or appeal in EDA's changed name, the Pan-Democratic Agrarian Front. Greeks may be forgiving in nature, but the rural community have good reason to remember the bloody and terrible excesses committed by Greek Communists and their foreign confederates, backed by Russia, during the civil war.

That the verdict given by the Greek people was spontaneous is self-evident from a cursory study of the figures. Of 5,432,623 electors listed on the rolls at 9,717 polling stations, 4,535,828 voted, giving an abstention rate of 16 per cent, compared with 23 per cent in the 1951 elections, 25 per cent in 1952, 25 per cent in 1956, and 24 per cent in 1958. These statistics, though not including civil and military employees, hardly suggest apathy, or unwillingness to vote, or that ERE's organisers drove the people to the polls. The Communist rout was of such dimensions as to rule out the idea of wholesale manipulation of the elections in Mr. Karamanlis' favour. The net result was that ERE gained 50 per cent of the total votes cast, the Centre Union polled 33.8 per cent, and the Communists, or PAME, 14.8 per cent.

Mr. Karamanlis is entitled to draw the utmost satisfaction from the results. Plainly he has received a mandate from the people to go ahead with his extensive economic five-year programme, which is rapidly transforming Greece from a backward and undeveloped country into one that promises to be the envy of her Balkan Communist neighbours. The drachma is one of the strongest currencies in the world. Greece, unlike Turkey, enjoys unprecedented political stability. It is to be hoped that the Centre Union will do its utmost to keep it that way. Greece's

international prestige has risen, and is rising higher since the recent election.

Greece's dynamic Premier has achieved wonders in his six years in power. The election outcome is the obvious reflection. There is still much unemployment and under-employment, even much poverty and real hunger, in Greece, but the foundations are surely being laid for a happier and prosperous future for a sorely tried and valiant people. "If only the people would be patient," said Mr. Karamanlis to me. There may still be many glaring social inequalities, but I am certain this tireless Prime Minister means to remedy them. His aim is to raise the standard of living of the Greek masses to a level equal to that of the most advanced of the European nations. The vast, ambitious programme for tourism, offering an unbounded vista in terms of finance and prestige, new industries, including shipyards, sugar and oil refineries, giving work to thousands; irrigation projects, electrification, and a modernised and more intensive agriculture—all these, and Greece's leading position in the shipping world, spell the measure of Mr. Karamanlis' success. Before the General Election, the Greek nation had heard with not a little pleasure that in the annual report of the UN Monetary Fund, where the development of the Greek economy was favourably commented upon, Greece was listed as one of the eight States which had attained a notably rapid degree of economic progress.

Slums and poverty around the back streets of the Piraeus will vanish as time goes on. New modern and luxurious hotels springing up everywhere in the country are not to benefit the rich of Greece. They are to provide accommodation for the thousands of expected new tourists, who will bring millions of pounds and dollars into the national coffers, and thus help to raise the standard of living of the masses. In the meantime, Mr. Karamanlis, in his six years of power, has provided 5,540 free houses for working-people, and offered another 4,440 on credit, in the Athens—Piraeus area. In the Polygonon district, where support for ERE in the elections was marked, there is much construction in working-class housing.

"I just want time to finish my work," said the Premier on the eve of the General Election. "I have served the Greek people with loyalty and honesty, and I need no special privileges to win." The results have fully vindicated his claims; the Press and Governments of the free world have acknowledged his accomplishments. Moscow and the most servile and obedient of the Communist satellites, Bulgaria, have substantially contributed to Mr. Karamanlis' triumph.

For the past few years Greece has been subjected to repeated abuse and threats from Russia because of her alignment with NATO. The movement in recent months of hundreds of former Greek Communist partisans from Iron Curtain countries into Bulgaria, for re-settlement along the Greek frontier, greatly incensed the Greek people. The democratic Greeks have no relish for an essentially alien creed. The siren lure of Communism will weaken in proportion as Mr. Karamanlis' plans to abolish poverty expand and bear fruit. International Communism, directed from Russia, is acutely aware of this; hence the pressure on Greece. But Communism has come up against a stone wall.

For all this, Greece cannot desire to win a reputation abroad for intolerance. The warning by the Independent newspaper *Ethnos* is timely. "Shrinking the extreme Left at any cost" by police measures or otherwise, is to be deplored, the paper rightly stresses. The warning applies largely to fanatics, but they should be curbed. EDA's strength has fallen naturally. This is greatly to the credit of the Greek people. Here I may recall a conversation I had, during a visit to Athens in 1947, in the Communist war, with Professor Kanellopolous, now again Deputy Prime Minister in the Karamanlis Government. "We cannot decisively beat Communism by force or with slogans," he said, "but only by opposing it with the more dynamic, positive ideas of democracy." This sound advice applies to the whole West today, yet the lesson has not been taken to heart.

## LITERARY SUPPLEMENT

## HISTORICAL STUDIES OF FRENCHMEN

*French Profiles; Prophets and Pioneers.* G. P. Gooch. Longmans. 30s.

"Political and social institutions are the embodiments of ideas and ideals, and in nineteenth-century France two main schools competed for support. Should the watchword be 'back to religion' or 'forward on secular lines'?" On the thread of this theme, Dr. Gooch hangs another array of some twenty studies of Frenchmen, grouped inevitably and naturally into those before, and those after, the great divide of 1789. In the former Bayle and Fontenelle have their place, as originators of the cult of reason and of science, but the bulk of the space (indeed one quarter of the whole book) is devoted to Voltaire as an Historian. The second bunch, the post-revolutionary thinkers, includes partly the luminaries of the Catholic revival (de Maistre, Lamennais, Montalambert, Lacordaire, Veuillot), partly the "secular sociologists" Saint-Simon, Michelet, Taine and Georges Sorel.

To these "profiles", studies of personalities even more than of ideas (though the two are, for the author, inseparable) he brings all the erudition, width of grasp and liberal sympathy which one has come to expect, almost as a right, from the writings of this grand old man who recently celebrated his eighty-eighth birthday. Of course, they vary in value and interest, some slight, some digging deeper into the recesses of personality and of thought, others revealing remarkable familiarity with the by-ways of historical source material.

The collection seems, to the present reviewer, somewhat less successful than Dr. Gooch's last volume on *The Second Empire*: it is less coherent and unified in theme, more fragmentary in method. It can be criticised for omissions that are too big to leave the rest as at all an adequate account of the trends of thought: no study of Montesquieu or Rousseau to set alongside Voltaire; too little on Voltaire himself as other than an historian; nothing on Comte, who as a "secular sociologist" surely mattered much more than Michelet or Taine; nothing on the mighty ideological battle during the Revolution itself. The chorus tends to crowd the real leading actors off the stage. Biography and intellectual history are not married together quite so easily as the author's chosen method would imply.

But perhaps the volume should not be taken as needing such unity. Its title suggests, after all, a mixed selection of men and ideas; and, treated as a succession of *causeries*, conducted in civilised and cultured manner in an easy-flowing voice, these essays can give pleasure and yield profit. Characteristically, they embody Dr. Gooch's indefatigable interest in the complexities of human personality, and the intellectual adventures of the human mind. If, to modern readers, used to writers tortured by their own perplexities, these essays seem almost too serene and simple, it may be no bad thing to be reminded of the older view that history is about people thinking and feeling, being and doing, and not about abstractions.

DAVID THOMSON

## COMPANION OF HONOUR

*Studies in Diplomatic History and Historiography in Honour of G. P. Gooch, C.H.* Planned and Edited by A. O. Sarkissian, Ph.D. Longmans. 45s.

Francis Hirst was wont to tell how, during the Boer War, when he and J. L. Hammond were planning contributors for the anti-jingo *Speaker*, they asked G. P. Gooch to review history. The reply? "Send everything down to the fourteenth century to H. A. L. Fisher and the rest to me." With some trepidation, for he was then 69, and I 24, I once invoked this story in 1942 when I was Dr. Gooch's Chairman for a lecture at The College of Preceptors. "Apocryphal", he pronounced, with

a smile. It is, nonetheless, as this gleaming *Festschrift* amply testifies, a fair enough summary of the breadth and depth of his interests. Like Thor with the drinking horn, Dr. Gooch has, as Professor Toynbee submits, all but drained the ocean of diplomatic history. There was, too, his rejoinder when a colleague protested that a certain theme was not "contemporary": "I am a contemporary of all the ages!" And had not his beloved John Morley proclaimed that "Every man of us has all the centuries in him?" Certainly Dr. Gooch has.

This *Festschrift* is brilliantly planned and skilfully executed, and Dr. Sarkissian, of the Library of Congress, is to be congratulated on the crowning success of his editorial labours. The volume is pre-eminently cosmopolitan. The 22 contributors from seven countries who pay homage to Dr. Gooch include two Presidents of the Historical Association, two Presidents of its US counterpart, the President *emeritus* of Yale University, the Vice-Chancellor of Dr. Gooch's own University, and the *Doyen honoraire* of the Sorbonne. Names which range from Barraclough, Butterfield, Geyl, Koht and Medlicott to Penson, Renouvin, Ritter, Schmitt, Toscano and Toynbee constitute a veritable drum-roll of history and historiography. The final product will rejoice the hearts of Dr. Gooch and all who believe with him that good history must also be good writing.

Professor Felix Hirsch, of Trenton, NJ, sometime political editor of the *Berliner Tageblatt*, contributes both a double-profile of Stresemann and Adenauer and a ten-page bibliography of Dr. Gooch's works, beginning with *English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century* (1898) and concluding with the essay on Viscount Samuel at 90 and with the studies of Lamennais, Lacordaire, Dupanloup and Michelet which first appeared in the *CONTEMPORARY REVIEW* in 1960.

Professor Butterfield presents thirty pages, crisp and delightful, on Acton, his training, methods and intellectual system. "Just as the law of love," says he, "is the widest generalisation that combines a cogent imperative with the need for adaptability to all varieties of circumstances, so Acton's doctrine of liberty and conscience was perhaps the most flexible thing that could be achieved if one were to confront history with any attitude or intellectual system or standard of values at all—the doctrine capable of embracing the widest variety of empirical data."

There are timely papers on the Hungarian declaration of war on the USSR in 1941 (Who *did* bomb Kassa?) by Dr. C. A. Macartney and on the Dreyfus affair in French diplomacy by Professor Maurice Baumont. The commentary by Professor Geoffrey Barraclough on the status of European-oriented history in the West should be pondered by every publicist who cares for such causes as an United States of Europe, the Common Market—or Atlantic Union.

This is indeed a book in which to browse throughout many months. Doubtless one of the essays per night for 22 nights would be a splendid prescription. Each one is concentrated essence to sustain and nourish not only the initiated but every man or woman who feels deeply about what is happening to the world family and how events take shape. The highest praise that can be bestowed upon the *Festschrift* is that it conforms to Dr. Gooch's standards of scholarship.

DERYCK ABEL

### LIFE OF CHRIST

*Son of Man.* Leslie Paul. Hodder & Stoughton. 21s.

There are those, among whom this reviewer includes himself, who have a concern about Christ as the Son of God, the Logos Incarnate of St. John's Gospel and Second Person of the Trinity. This, for them, is the basis of religious worship and they are not much interested in the historical and temporal life of Jesus in First Century Palestine. They would, betimes, find the life of Mahomet about equally interesting. At least in their first position they would have the support of almost all the Greek Fathers of the Early Church. The Greek Fathers, so far as the

Christian religion is concerned, were probably right. However, the modern mood tends in the opposite direction.

Most Western Christians today—this does not apply to Christians of the Eastern Churches—are temperamentally, even if unconsciously, Arians, if not Unitarians or Deists. Human anecdotes about the life of Jesus are what interest them. Indeed, in the case of H. G. Wells, the matter went further. God Almighty Himself became all-too-human, perspiring along like a super-Wells or at least a super-man to promote progress. Personally I regard all this anthropocentric egoism as profoundly irreligious or, at least, as non-religious. No mystic could accept it. This does not mean that a reverent re-telling of the Gospel story, against our present knowledge of the historical background, is not practicable. This is the basis of Papini's popular "Life of Christ." It is somewhat different from what Albert Schweitzer attempted. Schweitzer began, in his original doctoral thesis (medico-theological) by enquiring whether Jesus was a psychopath, and obligingly concluded that he was not. He then, in his *From Reimarus to Wriede* reviewed the various reviews, chiefly German but including Renan as well as Strauss, of the life of Jesus. Their primary quality was negativity and what Nietzsche called an 'all-too-human' stamp.

As distinct from these predecessors Mr. Lester Paul, who is no inconsiderable scholar, has provided a life of Jesus, excellently and even poetically written, which is informed, by study on the ground of Palestine itself, of all the most recent investigations, including those in the valley of Jericho and the land of the Dead Sea Scrolls. That Christ was in touch with the Essenes is a speculation at least thirty years old. Much of the evidence about this Jewish community is yet quite recent. Far from regarding religion as "an affair of private life", it was one of most meticulous communal discipline. Further, Mr. Paul's chapters upon the physical landscape of Palestine and the manners of its people in Christ's time are excellently done and stimulate an excited interest.

When Mr. Paul comes to the actual story of Christ Himself he adopts a rather unexpected compromise. It is not one likely to disconcert the public which will benefit by buying a book of great charm and patent sincerity and piety. It is for the theologians to decide whether Mr. Paul does not fall into the Adoptianist heresy. I suspect that he does. He seems to begin the life of Jesus as the Christ, in effect, with His baptism by John. He accepts the miracle of the Resurrection but rejects that of the Incarnation in its generally accepted form. It is an odd choice but one to which many Anglican divines, straddling two worlds, will take no exception. To the Greeks both assumptions were equally important; to the Jews neither; and, myself, I would accept both or neither. This at least can properly be said that Leslie Paul, in a piece of work not only conscientious but highly readable, instead of stilling thought and interest with conventional stereotypes, rather has set his readers with a beginning for their thinking.

GEORGE E. G. CATLIN

#### THE BOMBER OFFENSIVE

*The Strategic Air Offensive against Germany 1939-1945.* Sir Charles Webster and Noble Frankland. 4 volumes. H.M. Stationery Office. 42s. each volume.

President Kennedy recently described the Russian 50-megaton nuclear bomb as "primarily a mass killer of people in war" rather than a nuclear weapon of any real military use. The statement, if you accept it as expressing an attitude to the right use of nuclear weapons, might seem to indicate one entirely contrary to that which prompted the use of the first atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. But the problem of the proper, or militarily useful, employment of weapons of mass destruction goes back beyond the nuclear age. It is the dominating theme which emerges from these four volumes.



The weapon of mass destruction in question was not a single device but the available power of the Royal Air Force Bomber Command which, by the end of 1944, had become a massive striking force. The problem was to decide upon the best military use which could be made of it. It was a problem which was never resolved. That failure, rather than the selection of the wrong strategic target, lengthened the war by months, according to Sir Charles Webster and Dr. Frankland.

If the striking power of the heavy bombers could have been concentrated, they say, it seems possible that this could have decided the issue, in the sense of enabling other forces to end the war in the first months of 1945. But to the end the strategic effort was tragically dispersed as a result of the bitter quarrel over objectives between the Air Staff and the C-in-C. Bomber Command.

Sir Charles Portal had been an enthusiastic supporter of the plan to strike at German oil production as far back as 1940 when he was himself leading Bomber Command. But by 1944 he was at loggerheads with Sir Arthur Harris who was working his way down a list of German cities marked for "virtual destruction". Between Sir Charles Portal and Sir Arthur Harris the question was almost entirely a military one. The kind of moral judgment implicit in the remark of President Kennedy about nuclear weapons was not a major consideration. When the "area bombing" of German cities was called off at the beginning of April, 1945 by the Prime Minister, he based his argument on the practical interests of the allies who would find themselves occupying a devastated Germany.

But through the preceding months public reaction to the bombing of residential areas had been growing in Britain. It was kept in check by the constant pronouncements of ministers that bombing was aimed at military or industrial targets and the implication that vast damage to residential areas was incidental and even regrettable. It was this attitude, assumed for good reasons of morale, which may have led to the impression that "terror bombing" was carried out by Bomber Command in defiance of humane remonstrations from the government. Sir Arthur Harris was conscious of this unfair reflection when he complained that bomber crews might assume they were being asked to perform deeds which the Air Ministry was ashamed to admit.

In fact Bomber Command was following directives going back as far as February 1942 which transferred their attentions from dockyards and factories to "built-up areas" generally. From that vague directive stems the amazing quarrel within the air force with its incalculable effects on the conduct and length of the war. It was a quarrel which culminated in outright defiance by Sir Arthur Harris of his superiors. The final efforts of the Chief of the Air Staff to persuade Harris to concentrate on the oil targets were frustrated by the latter's threat to give up his command. For the last few months of the war Harris did little more than compromise with the wishes of the Allied Command.

Summing up the controversy, the authors consider that Portal was right. Not only would the concentration upon oil have shortened the war but it would have had consequently far-reaching effects. "Less thought would have been given to using the strategic air forces to assist the Russian offensive and more to winning a rapid victory in the West. If this could have been achieved not only would many German and Allied lives have been saved, but there would also have been political consequences of great importance to the future of Europe. So great were the stakes of the oil offensive." The conclusion is fully supported by post-war evidence of the effect of city bombing on the German population. Like the people of British cities, the Germans learned to live with the bombing and continued to work. It was only the destruction of their factories which deprived them of productive capacity. Until the destruction of Dresden, says the history, there was little decline in the will to work.

If this seems a harsh indictment of Sir Arthur Harris, the History of Bomber

Command, as told in these volumes, is also his vindication. Without his personal achievement in building up a powerful striking force from what was at one time a nearly demoralised remnant, there would have been no Bomber Command worth quarrelling about. Inevitably the questions of bombing objectives in which he was deeply involved are revived upon the publication of this history. These are after all the matters mainly relevant to our present situation. But as history the story of the bomber offensive is a worthy memorial to the crews of the Command.

Photographs and text tell often for the first time the story which began with the Blenheims and the Wellingtons and ended with the Lancasters and Mosquitos sweeping almost unhindered over enemy territory.

MICHAEL STEVENSON

### THE AGE OF WILBERFORCE

*Fathers of the Victorians.* Ford K. Brown. Cambridge University Press. 55s.

By what statistics may we gauge the pressure brought to bear on the social questions of this age? Why did the Abolition Campaign draw in thousands of men and women of rank and power whom Wesley's teaching could not touch? How were the foundations of a tremendously emotional and true crusade laid—a crusade with a more explicit Christian righteousness?

These are the points under consideration and Mr. Brown has been concerned to put before his readers the position as Wilberforce himself saw it. Referring to the abolition of the slave trade, the author says:

"This is an accomplishment so great that to describe it in a few lines seems deeply insensitive. But it is done here in a work that has in part the object of pointing out that wonderful as that achievement was, Wilberforce did still more; for in estimating its place in total achievement we come to the extraordinary fact that he did not think of it as his life's work but rather as a part, and not the most important part of some greater work."

In this volume we see how the sensible acceptance of the manners of the age constituted one of Wilberforce's most special qualifications for the leadership of the Evangelical reform and was a major factor of its success. Behind him in his task stands the unique personality of Mrs. Hannah More. We are given a full and reasoned review of her influence—her moral writings, her determined and tireless pursuit of the provision of Sunday Schools and her pertinacity in the Blagdon controversy. No literary figure of the time seems more "dated" to us now than the creator of the tracts of Cheap Repository. Yet Wilberforce declared that he would rather go up to render his account of the last day carrying with him Mrs. More's "The Shepherd of Salisbury Plain" than with all the volumes of Sir Walter Scott's works, "full as they are of genius".

"Fathers of the Victorians" is enriched by much documentary evidence and contains a comprehensive bibliography and excellent notes. There are extracts from Southey—that most eminent of biographers—and the narrative is enlivened by the objections of anti-Evangelicals in the shape of William Cobbett, Mrs. Piozzi, Mrs. Siddons and the Swan of Lichfield. In pondering on the Wilberforce enigma—according to Mme. de Stael "the most loved and respected man in England", according to the Cobbetts and Hazlitts "a pious rogue"—reproductions of portraits of the main protagonists would have been a helpful inclusion to the publication.

Mr. Brown, in developing his theme, has shown how the movement found stage by stage the projects indispensable for its success. First "Missions to the Heathen", the weighty public cause arousing self-denial, toil and sacrifice. Next the widespread establishment of the Sunday Schools and lastly the British and Foreign Bible Society, the institution which was to penetrate into the life of the mass of

English people, revealing a great strength of religious principle. Here the author pauses to contemplate how far the passions of multitudes of men were guided into paths of moderation and constitutional reform by the mass distribution of hundreds of thousands of Bibles and Testaments. In so doing he reaches the conclusion that the nation responsible for the work was the one profiting the most thereby.

A section entitles "Ten Thousand Compassions" surveys the host of philanthropic societies that became a common feature of English life. Subsequent pages discuss the comic accounts of this kind of reform which occur in the novels of such anti-Evangelicals as Dickens, Thackeray and Wilkie Collins. Of a more serious literary import and of greater significance are the later chapters of the book which give authenticity to some of the Evangelical characters and situations in the novels of Jane Austen, George Eliot and others.

BERYL GASTER

## TWO POETS—TWO MODES

*Garland for the Winter Solstice.* Ruthven Todd. Dent. 16s.

*Poems.* Herbert Corby. The Fortune Press. 12s. 6d.

Mr. Todd is a Scot by birth who in 1959 became an American citizen. In this substantial selection of his poems, with each piece dated and giving the name of the place where it was written (a compliment to American thoroughness, and doubtless to make easier the researches of future literary historians), Mr. Todd reveals himself as an accomplished nature poet with a mainly modernistic idiom. His observation is acute and accurate, as when he sees:

"Like a singed black lash, curled in the embers  
Of the night, spiralling from opening day, the skein  
Of Canada geese appears . . ."

or when he notes "a klaxon-throated jay" or "the sexy pollen" or "snipe trapped by their beaks in the ice, which had caught them unaware and fastened like a gin." But, unlike such poets as Wordsworth and Hardy, who also kept their eyes open, Mr. Todd seldom achieves a truly lyrical expression to make his observations memorable. He is utterly lucid in his intellectual approach to the wonders of nature, but the effect too often is of a steady endeavour to blur the division between poetry and prose.

I remember Mr. Corby's earlier book, "Time in a Blue Prison", and that it contained many delightful poems. A note tells us that he is a member of HM Foreign Service and has done tours of duty in Singapore, Budapest, Berlin and New York; and, as might be expected, his new collection reflects numerous sharp and colourful impressions. Most of this poet's verse-modes are traditional, and he yields rather easily to sensuous promptings in facile images; but here and there, as in the piece on Marlowe's death in the Deptford tavern, he achieves authentic poetry, and in the sonnet "Sunday School Treat" he fuses wit and observation so that we see the home-returning children emptying their pockets on the coach seats: "salt sludge, unbuttoned crabs and half-used sweets."

WILLIAM KEAN SEYMOUR

## OGDEN NASH VERSE FOR MIDDLE-BROWS

*Collected Verse, from 1929 On.* Ogden Nash. Dent. 30s.

The most prolific magazine-verse writer in America here offers 508 pages of contributions to the gaiety of nations. *Make 'em laugh* might well be the Ogden Nash creed; and having beaten out a number of successful patterns in short and long lines, he sticks to them with often convulsive effect. I know business men, doctors and colonels who hate poetry and pity poets but are always producing

little Nash books after dinner, or relying on their memory when passing the port:

"Candy  
Is dandy  
But liquor  
Is quicker."

Sometimes he takes one at the ladies:

"Darling, what is that?  
That, angel, is a hat.  
Are you positive? Are you certain?  
Are you sure it's not a curtain?  
Shall you really place your head in it?  
How's for keeping cake and bread in it?"

Or:

"He tells you when you've got on too much lipstick,  
And helps you with your girdle when your hips stick."

Or he succumbs to the time-honoured American temptation to twist the Lion's tale and tickle the groundlings at the same time:

"All good young Englishmen go to Oxford or Cambridge and they all write and publish books before their graduation,  
And I often wondered how they did it until I realized that they have to do it because their genteel accents are so developed that they can no longer understand each other's spoken words so the written word is their only means of intercommunication".

Well, Ogden Nash is a Transatlantic Institution; and it only remains for me to say that he probably earns more than all the serious poets put together earn, and that his publishers on both sides of the Pond count on his fans to make the purchase of this bulky tome their Christmas or New Year Resolution. Milton received Fourteen pounds for *Paradise Lost*. WILLIAM KEAN SEYMOUR

### MOROCCAN IMAGE

*Morocco Independent*. Rom Landau. Allen & Unwin. 35s.

Rom Landau has set out to project an accurate image of modern Morocco, both for the student of international affairs and the possible tourist. A difficult undertaking. Obviously one of his problems is that, precisely because of their speed, events have continually been overtaking his accounts. Governments have been overturned; his description of Agadir has been nullified by the earthquake; his portrait of Mohammed V has to be followed by mention of his death. The references to Mauritania are already out of date, since this state is now independent with every intention of remaining so. The economic situation continually fluctuates, and therefore even his latest reports do not give an exact picture. Nevertheless the book shows much careful observation, and an appreciative, yet critical assessment of endeavours which have been undertaken with all the enthusiasm of newly won freedom, though still with much clumsiness and many mistakes.

Rom Landau does give the true flavour of the different regions; the Atlantic coast, the rich plains, the desert, the Middle Atlas and the Rif. His information on such hopeful ventures as the *Communes Rurales*—about the only organisation in the country likely to foster grass-root democracy—the mountain youth camps, the new student's quarters at the Karaouine University, and the various moves to apply Morocco's wealth to her own needs and to stop the drain abroad, all this is valuable.

But an over-enthusiasm for Islamic culture often blinds him. His praises of generous Moslem charity do not impress anyone who has seen how riches and learning can co-exist in Fez with the sheer despair of abject poverty. Then the

recent Moroccan treatment of the Jewish community has not been generous. Though this is disguised in the book, the tone of the country's own press betrays the truth. Likewise, Moslem fanaticism hardly encourages the badly needed tourist, whose efforts to admire Moorish architecture are not helped by a general ban on entry into mosques. The section on medical services in the work is silent on the pioneering clinic set up by the monks at Toumliline, Azrou, which aided 28,000 patients in 1960; a fantastic achievement for a small group. **DÉSIRÉE HIRST**

### MEMOIRS OF SIR FRANCIS ROSE

*Saying Life*. Sir Francis Rose. Cassell. 42s.

*Saying Life* is an autobiography that reminds one, rather, of those writings of members of society from the fencing masters of the 18th century to the photographers of the 20th; but while Cecil Beaton, for example, by a heroic feat of ingenuousness, manages to convince one that he has met all the most beautiful, the most charming and the most talented people in the world and that it just happens that they are all in Debrett and the Almanack, Sir Francis Rose is unable to do the same for Hitler, Rohm, Goering, Horthy, Mussolini and the rest. This is not just because people he has met are simply more repulsive than most; it is more a matter of his own personality and style of writing. In fact, the people he met included many who are genuinely interesting or admirable—Colette, for example, and also Cocteau and Gertrude Stein who bought his pictures. There are actually more mentions of Cocteau than Hitler or of Stein than Rohm; and yet I think it would not be unfair to say that the book is dominated by the Fascists in it. The one passage which I am sure I shall remember, for example, is a quotation from Hitler speaking to Sir Francis in September, 1939: "England, especially Yorkshire, will not declare war because the Celts from Scotland and Wales would attack them. . . ."

It is true that Rose is no more Fascist than any other right-winger with an occasional taste for social comment; but he is no doubt aware that, while every society, artistic or literary memoir writer of the 20's and 30's has met Cocteau, Stein and Bérard, not many have travelled in a luxuriously-appointed bomber to visit Goering at his country house or have had charcoal biscuits prescribed them by Hitler, and this really is the point. Sir Francis Rose is, I would say, a fairly good if not very important painter; but in the book he says nothing about his art or what he has done, almost nothing about what he has seen or how he has changed. It is simply a catalogue of whom he has met and what they have said. He has not even tried to select what they said of importance but just to record snippets of conversation and, more particularly, those social or artistic attitudes and those fancy-dress parties that would show that they and he were in the height of fashion at the time.

The style apparently is a kind of name and occasion dropping so allusive that it is normally impossible to determine what is happening. This is the jargon meaning of the title of the book: "*Saying Life*" rather than say "*The Story of My Life*". Inserted in it are the set pieces about Rohm, etc., and certain declarations of the attitude of the author to social problems of staggering naïveté, for example, that opium is OK for aristocrats, contemptible for the working classes.

What he recalls of the intellectual and artistic figures of his period is largely uninteresting. What he recalls of the Fascists is interesting only because of the fascination of evil people and is in itself generally fatuous while his judgments seem horrifyingly imperceptive. I can only end by two typical quotes: from his characterisation of Franco, "A soldier must be a pacifist, the enemy of war-mongers, the maintainer of the race, and the father of the people. Franco has been this for many years in a purely Christian way", and of Goering, "But it is hard to imagine anyone with a more delightful personality than this cultured man of taste".

MICHAEL COMPTON

## NOTICES

**TOPOLSKI'S LEGAL LONDON** (Stevens. £3 13s. 6d.) This is a superbly produced volume, published for "The Lawyer", which will appeal far beyond the legal profession. Through the genius of Feliks Topolski, and with a very engaging supporting text by Francis Cowper, we are shown the panoply and customs of the Law and Judges, the Inns of Court with their close literary associations, as well as legal, and the work of Solicitors. While the text is written by a well-known historian of legal London, the cartoons are by a layman, with a layman's insight and reaction. Topolski has a remarkable power of depicting the essence of his theme, with bold and energetic realism. As Mr. Jonathon Stone says in his Preface: "Gesture governs each scene with passionate energy, the energy which is the hall-mark of Topolski's art. His view of all life—not only of the legal world—is dominated by fluid, yet deliberate movement . . . Topolski has no time for pedantry in his fluent artistic vocabulary. His is the language of urgency and with it he conveys in characteristic fashion here not necessarily likeness or detail, for that is not his intention, but the compelling movement and individual attitude". In this legal field, Topolski's approach is most effective. There are some fourteen drawings, 13 by 8½ inches, and one double page illustration of the Judges' procession at the re-opening of the Law Courts. They are all superbly reproduced in photolithography.

Lord Birkett, with his lifelong legal career as advocate and judge, very aptly writes the Forword.

**THE FIRST NIGHT OF TWELFTH NIGHT.** (Heinemann. 10s. 6d.) There has long been a cherished tradition among the barristers of the Middle Temple that *Twelfth Night* was first performed in their Hall before Queen Elizabeth on the 2nd February, 1601. Indeed Sir Donald Wolfitt produced the play in the Hall in 1951 in celebration of the 350th anniversary. This tradition, however, received a shattering shock from that erudite literary detective, Dr.

Leslie Hotson, in this book first published in 1954, and now reprinted in the Mercury Books series. Dr. Hotson marshalled a great deal of cogent evidence to show that the first performance was in fact performed in honour, for political reasons, of Don Virginio Orsino, Duke of Bracciano, on a visit to Britain. Much of this vibrating book is Dr. Hotson's reconstruction of how the play came to be written, Orsino's visit, the environment of the Court, and a pen picture of the leading courtiers involved in the production. He explains the topical allusions, including the identification of Malvolio with the Queen's unpopular Comptroller, Sir William Knollys. Dr. Hotson also discusses the mechanics of the Elizabethan stage, with particular reference to the four-sided arena stage used at Whitehall for this performance. Dr. Hotson writes with erudition, enthusiasm and dramatic effect.

**BERTOLT BRECHT.** *Tales from the Calendar.* (Methuen. 15s.) This short volume of stories, poems and anecdotes was compiled by Brecht in 1947 after his return from exile and was first published in German in 1949. In this English translation, the prose is translated by Yvonne Kapp and the verse by Michael Hamburger. "This volume contains most of the short stories Brecht wrote and considered worth preserving". They include, for example, *The Augsburg Chalk Circle* which is the forerunner of his play, *The Caucasian Chalk Circle*, and *The Experiment* based upon Sir Francis Bacon's famous experiment in refrigeration, when shortly before his death he had a dead chicken stuffed with snow. Incidentally, he greatly overstates Bacon's guilt as Lord Chancellor. The collection concludes with fifty Keuner anecdotes. As the Note points out, Brecht's choice accords with his expressed view "that the function of literature, whether in drama, verse or prose, is to stimulate, through entertainment, the wits, the social consciousness and the moral sensibilities of ordinary men and women".



# **CRIME AND BANDITRY, DISTRESS AND PERPLEXITY**

will increase UNTIL THE BISHOPS OPEN

## **JOANNA SOUTHCOTT'S BOX OF SEALED WRITINGS**

What the Bible says about the Box and the Bishops "And the temple of God was opened . . . and there was seen . . . the Ark (Chest or Box) of his Testament (or Will). And round about the Throne were four-and-twenty . . . Elders (Bishops) sitting . . . (and they) fall down . . . and cast their crowns (their wisdom) before the Throne." Rev. xl. 19 : iv. 4, 10.

**THE PANACEA SOCIETY, Bedford, England.**

## **TYPEWRITERS!**

**New and Rebuilt**

**ADDING, BOOK-KEEPING**

**HIRE AND REPAIRS**

**AND CALCULATING MACHINES**

**74 CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, W.C.2**

**TAYLORS** HOLBORN  
3793

### **ORDER FORM**

**To THE SUBSCRIPTION MANAGER,  
CONTEMPORARY REVIEW,  
42 BROADWAY,  
LONDON, S.W.1.**

**I enclose herewith my cheque for 53s./\$10, for a year's subscription.**

**Name** .....

**Address** .....  
.....  
.....

# THE BRITISH SURVEY

published for over 22 years  
The monthly periodical specializing in one  
country or topic of international interest

Recent issues include :—

## Main Series

The World of Mr. Khrushchev—

1. Soviet Foreign Policy—A. Wiseman.
2. Internal Developments in the USSR—N. Bindler.

Mexico—Irene Nicholson.

Hungary—Five years after the Revolution—P. Katonay and L. Jotischky.

Popular Series—December issue—The UAR and Syria.

Price—Main Series—1/6d. Popular Series—10d.

Joint yearly subscription—30s.

Write to—

The Editor, British Survey,

Benjamin Franklin House, 36 Craven Street, London, W.C.2.

# PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS

The Quarterly Journal of the Hansard Society for  
Parliamentary Government

The current issue includes articles on:

THE FRENCH REFERENDUM, 1961

By Phillip M. Williams

THE POWER OF THE CONTEMPORARY PRESIDENCY

By Robert S. Hirschfield

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE POTENTIAL STRENGTH OF THE LIBERAL PARTY  
FOR THE FUTURE OF BRITISH POLITICS

By Jorgen Rasmussen

With a comment by Mark Bonham Carter

Annual Subscription 30s., \$4.50

Single Copies 7s. 6d., \$1.25

THE HANSARD SOCIETY FOR  
PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT

79/80 Petty France, London, S.W.1.



CURRENT PERIODICAL SERIES

PUBLICATION NO.: 865

TITLE : CONTEMPORARY REVIEW.

VOLUME: 201  
202

ISSUES: 1152-1157  
1158-1163

DATE: January - December 1962

This publication is reproduced by agreement with the publisher. Extensive duplication or resale without permission is prohibited.

University Microfilms, London